DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 327 IR 008 416

AUTHOR Daval, Nicola, Ed.
TITLE The Future of Scholarly Communication. Minutes of the Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (95th, Washington, D.C., October 17-18, 1979).
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 82p.; For related document, see ED 176 795.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communications; *Cost Effectiveness; *Humanities; *Library Catalogs; Meetings; Professional Associations; *Research Libraries; *Scholarly Journals

ABSTRACT

This report provides the verbatim minutes of the meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) on the theme, The Future of Scholarly Communication. Comments by David W. Breneman and Warren J. Haas on the Report of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication were followed by general discussion, as was Richard W. Boss's The Library Catalog Cost Model: A Tool for Decision Makers. James Banner gave a special address on Research Libraries and the Humanities. The business meeting included the reports of the President, Executive Director, Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria, Executive Director Search Committee, Task Force on National Library Network Development, Committee on Interlibrary Loan; and on the Office of Management Studies and on the China Trip. Appendices contain the reports of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control and the Committee on a National Bibliographic System, as well as membership and attendance lists. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187327

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Future of Scholarly Communication

Minutes of the Ninety-Fifth Meeting

OCTOBER 17-18, 1979
WASHINGTON, D.C.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Mandel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1980
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.

I R008416

MAR 19 1980

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually by the Association, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Price: ARL Members, $10.00 per year, $5.00 an issue
Nonmembers, $15.00 per year, $7.50 an issue

Editor: Nicola Daval
Association of Research Libraries

Association of Research Libraries
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N.J., etc.]
v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th-10th, 12th called respectively: 10th-11th, 13th.
INDEXES:
Subject index.

1st-42d, Dec. 1932-Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59-30046

Library of Congress [ ]

Printed in U.S.A. ISSN 0044-9652

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.

CONTENTS

Page

Opening 1

THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENQUIRY INTO SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION
David W. Breneman 2
Warren J. Haas 8

DISCUSSION 13

THE LIBRARY CATALOG COST MODEL: A TOOL FOR DECISION MAKERS
Richard W. Boss 19

DISCUSSION 27

SPECIAL ADDRESS
RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND THE HUMANITIES
James Banner 28

BUSINESS MEETING 33

Announcement of New Vice President/President-Elect 33
Election of Board Members 33
Report of Executive Director (with comments by Ms. Child) 33
Report of the Committee on Interlibrary Loan 37
Admission of New Members 38
Report of the Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria 39
Report of the Executive Director Search Committee 44
Report on the Office of Management Studies 44
Report of the Task Force on National Library Network Development 47
Report on the China Trip 51
Report of the President 55

APPENDICES

A. Annual Report of the ARL Task Force on Bibliographic Control 58
B. Report of the Committee on a National Periodicals System 59
C. Attendance at the 95th Membership Meeting 60
Institutional List
Name Index for Members
Guest and Staff
D. Officers, Board of Directors, Committees, and Task Forces of the Association 68
E. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries 73

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 95th Meeting

Le Moyne W. Anderson, Presiding

The Ninety-fifth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries convened at the Shoreham Americana Hotel, Washington, D.C., October 17-18, 1979.

President Le Moyne W. Anderson opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing both the new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and the guests of the Association.

President Anderson then turned the program over to Connie Dunlap, who introduced the morning's speakers.

THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENQUIRY INTO SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

David W. Breneman
Brookings Institution

MS. DUNLAP (DUKE UNIVERSITY): Our program this morning centers around the report of the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication.[1] The report has some significant implications for research libraries, and among the things we want to accomplish this morning is a discussion of how we can benefit from this report.

Our first speaker is David Breneman. His Ph.D. in economics comes from the University of California at Berkeley, and most of his research has been in the economics of higher education. He also has been on the faculty at Amherst, and he is currently Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution. Dr. Breneman was appointed to the Governing Board of the National Enquiry, and he, along with Herbert Morton, was volunteered by his colleagues to write the report.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Dr. Breneman.

MR. BRENEMAN: Thank you, Connie. That is a great euphemism, "volunteered by his colleagues to help write the report" — I never knew what hit me. Actually, I did know what hit me when Herb Morton and I got into this over a year ago. In fact, when this invitation to speak arrived some months ago, it caused me to reflect back to your annual meeting of a year ago when we were right in the throes of writing the report, and feeling very inept and inadequate to the task. I remember coming to the meeting, listening to all of the discussion, and being more than ever convinced that what Herb Morton and I had gotten into was an impossible task. I would never have thought a year ago that we would have had the report out in May, and that in October I would be able to reflect back on the report and reactions to it over a four or five month period.

There are three main points I want to touch on briefly, and then, perhaps, we will have some questions and answers.

First, I want to talk a bit about the orientation of the report itself, because I think that orientation shifted as we began work on the report and has continued to be a subject of some misunderstanding. I would like at least to explain to you how I see the report, what it was intended to do, the audience it was directed toward, and some additional observations.

Secondly, I thought I would share with you a few of the specific results that have occurred since the publication of the report — some of the reactions to it, some of the actions that have been taken. I am going to steer away from the library sector per se. Jim Haas will talk to you much more knowledgeably than I about some of the developments with the periodicals center and other areas, so I thought I would touch on a few other things that might interest you.

And thirdly, I am sure most of you read the infamous August Frugé attack on the Enquiry into Scholarly Communication[2] that came out just about the same time the report did. One of the anonymous drafters of the report was quoted as saying that the chapter on libraries was the weakest chapter in the book. Since I was that anonymous drafter who was quoted, and since I wrote that chapter on libraries, I thought I would give you some reflections on what I meant and how I see that chapter relative to the other parts of the report.

I think it is true, having served as a member of the original drafting committee that wrote the proposal for this project, and having lived through the three years of the active life of the Board with even more serious involvement toward the end, that the orientation of the group involved in this Enquiry changed over the course of the five years. I can remember in those early meetings, back in '73, '74, and '75, Herbert Bailey, Director of the Princeton University Press, had a vision of a five-year, monumental study that would look at the role of scholarship and the role of books in America. It was to include everything down to children's books, a monumental task that would have tried to look at the role of the print media, if you will, in all aspects of life — certainly not limited to the scholarly audience, certainly not limited to the kinds of subjects that we dealt with ultimately in the Enquiry. We went from that very broad vision to a successively narrow vision. But there was still a sense, I think, even as we began the actual work, that the Enquiry would be a major research activity that would somehow discover new truths, that there would be lots of surprises and new ideas that had never been thought of before, that an enormous data base would be generated, and so forth.

As it turned out, the report we actually wrote is not that kind of report; it is a policy document. Its intended audience is people: policy makers, busy people in universities, in foundations, in government; people who are not as directly immersed on a day-to-day basis in the workings of this enterprise as each of you, but a group that we felt needed to get, in a fairly succinct package, a coherent view of the total enterprise we were talking about, and some very explicit recommendations for action. I think we have successfully produced that type of document.

We have not produced and have not tried to replicate, for example, the undertakings of Fritz Machlup and his associates.[3] The major research activity of the Enquiry was the scholar survey, and we have, I think, made some good contributions there. The report has to be seen as a policy document rather than a major research contribution per se to this field.

With that in mind, we put a major emphasis on the overview, which is the first chapter of the report. As many of you know, that chapter was reprinted subsequently as an issue of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Newsletter and, I understand, sent out to 7,000 or more individual faculty members throughout the land. Thus there has been an attempt to get the message out, not just to people in decision-making roles, but also to faculty members who are very much an important part of this system of scholarly communication.

The emphasis in the overview, as you know, was from a public finance perspective. Herb Morton and I are both economists; we simply worked from the point of view of economics. We tried to look at where markets were failing and what parts of the system might function without subsidy or direct intervention.

There was also an emphasis on action. We were not interested in producing a report that would simply, as the cliche would have it, gather dust on the shelf. We wanted to come out with something that had specific recommendations that people could pick up and do. Ultimately the report will have to be judged on that basis.

I think the professionals in the individual parts of the system — university press directors, journal editors, librarians — have not learned much in the chapters directed to their particular part of the system that they did not already know. We hope, however, and I suspect that to some degree this happened, that some may have learned something about the other parts of the system by reading those chapters. In fact, if there is any one area in which the Enquiry was particularly successful, it was in advancing the idea that this is an interlocking system. One of the great difficulties that Edward Booher director of the Enquiry, 1976-78 and his associates faced in trying to cope with scholarly communication was knowing how to get hold of this system; it has so many parts and its interactions are complex. But we did push through the message that what happens in libraries is really more central to the effort than in other parts of the system because libraries are the source of demand for the products of the journal editors and the university presses. Library economics and developments in this area are dominant to the success or failure of individual enterprises in the publishing side. And, I think, we have driven that message home in a way that perhaps had not been as fully understood in all parts of this enterprise before.

Now a few specific results since the publication of the report.

First: sales. How has the book itself sold? Well, I am happy to report that the paperback is already into a second printing. The original printing was of 4,000 paper and has been sold out. The report was for a brief period last month — I am not sure about this month — on the Johns Hopkins' best seller list, which means that it sold at least 100 copies, both in cloth and paper. (You have a much diminished vision of what a "best seller" is in this world than you have in the world of Harold Robbins.)

MR. HAAS: You should have named it The Joy of Scholarly Communication.

DR. BRENEMAN: We actually toyed with different titles. The Joy of Scholarly Communication, Jim reminds me, is one we had seriously considered. Actually, I think it is the classy green color that may be attracting people. However, by and large, for somebody who works in and writes books in this general area, going into a second printing and having sales now of probably well over 4,000 copies is very respectable. The typical Carnegie Commission volume was lucky to sell 3,000 copies. There is just not a huge market out there, much as we would like to think there is. I think this book has done remarkably well.

There have been a number of follow-up events, this being one of them. Jim Haas, Herb Morton, and I went to the Association of American University Presses (AAUP) meeting in Salt Lake City at the end of June and conducted a three-hour session on the report. I spoke about it at the first annual meeting of a new association — I am not sure whether it is called the Conference on Scholarly Communication or the Association of Scholarly Communication.[4] Their first meeting was held in Boston in early June, and the report was highlighted there. Herb Morton is going to speak about the report at the forthcoming American

Council on Education meeting in Houston. I am sure that over the next few months there will continue to be opportunities to talk about the report and to keep its ideas alive.

Perhaps the biggest single thing that we helped — we certainly cannot take credit for it, but we did help nudge it along — was the legislation to create a National Periodicals Center (NPC)[5]. As you know, an NPC became a featured recommendation in the report, and Jim Haas will perhaps say something more about it.

One very concrete follow-up from one of our recommendations is that the Carnegie Corporation has recently made a three-year grant to the ACLS to carry out Recommendation No. 12 in the report. Recommendation No. 12 called for the formation of a group composed of the three principal components of the system: scholars, represented by ACLS; librarians, represented by ARL; and press directors, represented by AAUP. We talked about it in terms of a group that needs to continuously monitor technology and the developments that are rapidly coming to the fore in this field. I believe that the group that is now financed and in the process of being constituted will take a somewhat broader mission and, in a sense, continue the discussion and the concern of the total systems approach. We will have a forum for publishers, librarians and scholars to keep in touch with each other on some of the policy issues that develop.

As you may know, we recommended that the National Endowment for the Humanities establish an Office for Scholarly Communication. I am not absolutely up-to-date on that, though my sense is that they are not going to create, at least right away, a separate office. However, they are definitely, I think, going to build into their policy and planning unit an office or individual that will have responsibility for the area of scholarly communication and pick up some of the data collection efforts that we recommended.

More recently you may have seen the news release in Publishers' Weekly about the Wesleyan University Press/Columbia University Press agreement: Columbia will take over the noneditorial functions for Wesleyan Press. Cited prominently in the news release was the comment that the fact that we had recommended this sort of economy or joint operation in the report helped bring that agreement about. Again, I do not think the report should take credit for it; I am sure those discussions were already under way. But sometimes a report like this can give people a push and a sense of support.

In other developments, I gather that a number of universities in the South loosely gathered together under the rubric of the Oak Ridge Consortium are, in fact, apparently stimulated by the report into gathering together as a university press consortium to begin exploration of joint warehousing, joint filming, and some additional processes that we recommended. We also gave a good deal of publicity to the Helen and Dwight Reed Foundation, which, through the publishing house Heldref, has specialized in taking over small journals that are in deep difficulty financially, helping to put them on a steady financial basis. One of the individuals who was very critical of our report, a professor at Temple University who edits the Journal of the Wordsworth Society, found out about Heldref from our report, and in fact, that journal is now being published by Heldref.

The major criticism, apart from the general and broader criticisms of the National Periodicals Center that August Frugé and others have expressed, centers on the question of the small humanities journal and how some of the recommendations in the report may affect those journals. I think that the ACLS/ARL/AAUP committee that is going to be set up with this new Carnegie grant may take that on as one of their areas of concern.

Now, finally, a few comments on the library chapter. I have referred to Gus Frugé's accurate reference to my comment that, of the four chapters in the book, it was in some sense the weakest. By that I meant the Enquiry itself, for the three years that it worked under Ed Booher's leadership, simply did not do much library research. Its emphasis and its activities were spent primarily on the scholar survey and on a series of other investigations having more to do with the journals and the presses. So when Herb Morton and I went over the materials that we inherited, and began attempting to make some sense out of it, we simply did not have much on libraries. I understand that Ed's decision not to spend a lot of effort looking into library problems per se was based on the judgment that there was already a good body of research on libraries in existence, and that it was not matched by a parallel body of research on presses and journals. So, in a sense, I think that was a rational allocation of time and effort.

On the other hand, the library chapter had to be literally created out of whole cloth; we didn't have any framework or previous materials. With help from Jim Haas, Suzanne Frankie, John Lorenz, and others in Washington, I was able to quickly gather a lot of information. In fact, I remember about this time last year tottering across Dupont Circle over to Brookings with a one-foot stack of material that had been carefully collected for me to begin my education in library research.

I had a distinct sense that we were not contributing any great new insights, that if there was anything that was done by the Enquiry in the library area, it might have been some blending of my background in the economics of higher education with materials that were already present in the library literature. Again, I was still at that stage thinking of the report in the context of "Gee, we promised this was going to be a vast and an important scholarly contribution, and here I have the sense that we are really just integrating already existing research, and that is not terribly impressive."

The flip side of that, however, is that I think the research that does exist on libraries probably is, and still remains, much better than the research on some of the other parts of the scholarly communication system. Thus in another absolute sense, the chapter on libraries may be the strongest chapter in the book in that it is probably based on more solid research than, even after Enquiry's efforts, the other two chapters are.

The main weakness in that chapter that I sense — and again August Frugé noted this in our meeting — is that there really is not much comment in that chapter on the internal library management issues and the library professional education issues to parallel the comments and emphasis that we had in the other chapters. The press chapter and the journals chapter have a lot of discussion about ways to manage those enterprises better, things to do, economics of scale. In fact, that almost became the dominant emphasis in those two chapters, whereas the library chapter really says very little about the day-to-day activities of librarians.

I think that is a weakness in the chapter. Jim Haas and I discussed it earlier, and I simply decided we did not have enough — or I did not have enough — to say on it. But I will leave that dangling for you as a task to be taken up by "National Enquiry II."

Thank you.

* * * * * * *

References:

[1]Scholarly Communication: The Report of the National Enquiry. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.)

[2]August Frugé. "Two Cheers for the National Enquiry: A Partial Dissent," Scholarly Publishing 10 (April 1979): 211-18.

[3]Fritz Machlup et al., Information Through the Printed Word: The Dissemination of Scholarly, Scientific, and Intellectual Knowledge, 3 vols. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978).

[4]Society for Scholarly Publishing.

[5]"National Periodicals Center" is used as it appears in Scholarly Communication, while "National Periodical Center" is used in H.R. 5192, adopted by the House on November 7, 1979. In these Minutes, the plural form "Periodicals" is used throughout.

THE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENQUIRY INTO SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION (continued)

Warren J. Haas
Council on Library Resources

MS. DUNLAP: Our next speaker is Warren James Haas and he hardly needs any introduction to this group. But when I asked him last night how he would like to be introduced, he told me. And I ought to get even with him —

(Laughter.)

— by introducing him that way. The trouble is it would not embarrass him, but it would embarrass me.

(Laughter.)

So I will just leave it that our next speaker is our distinguished visionary President of the Council on Library Resources, Mr. Haas.

MR. HAAS: Before I start, I want to thank you for something. A year ago, as the Council went through its most recent sequence of seeking candidates for the Management Intern Program, we became concerned that the number of people who seemed interested had slowly drifted downward over the five years of the program. I wrote a letter to all of you last spring and asked that you try to identify some individuals on your staffs who might possibly be interested in applying. You succeeded.

We have 99 applications at the moment, which is at least 25 higher than the number we had in the first year of the program. We are budgeted for five interns this year, and I am tremendously pleased. I think 25 or 30 of those people who have actually completed applications are from ARL libraries; there are a number from non-ARL libraries as well. It reinforces our view that that enterprise is something worth preserving and maybe expanding. So thank you.

As you know, David Breneman and I have been asked to review the National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication. He has described the course of the enterprise and some of the specific recommendations, has identified some early visible results, and has made some supplementary general observations. Because our real purpose is to talk with you, I want to spend only a few minutes of the time allotted to me to focus specifically on the recommendations relating to libraries. In doing so, I will also refer to the chapter on research libraries that appeared in Research Universities and the National Interest,[1] published in December 1977, because the Enquiry and that publication are not unrelated. My intent is not to repeat what all of you have read in the Enquiry but rather to provide, very briefly, a personal interpretation of the months of discussion that, I hope, might prompt each of you to reflect on some of the underlying issues and, possibly, cause you to act in the future on certain matters in a way that will reflect the spirit of the National Enquiry.

The lucidity of the report, which reflects the narrative and organizational skills of its co-authors, Herbert Morton and David Breneman, belies the difficulties that were encountered along the way. To give some sense of the dimension of these difficulties, I might turn to the words of the rancher whose land lay in the foothills of the Canadian Rockies, breathtaking in their beauty. In response to a comment by an awed tourist, he said, "Oh, the mountains are all right, I guess, but they sure spoil the view."

The Enquiry began its work facing the mountains — the interests of journal publishers, university presses, scholarly groups, and research libraries — and tried to look beyond those interests without overlooking them. In a real sense, the Enquiry sought to establish, in the process of scholarly communication, a whole that is greater than the sum of the parts. It has been the kind of enterprise that has helped to expand the horizons of the self-interested — publishers, scholars, and even librarians. There is much still to be done, but I think a beginning has been made.

Now let us consider the library segment of the report, which turned out to be more prominent than one might have predicted and is, perhaps, the most far-reaching in terms of potential impact on all other components of the system of scholarly communication.

The visibility of libraries in the report stimulated some barbed banter about how the librarian members of the governing Board had, by one device or another, outmaneuvered the representatives of the other "sectors." After all, the exercise was begun on the initiative of university presses, which were desperately concerned with their fiscal futures. But such was not the case. On reflection, I think it is clear that our Enquiry colleagues were the most perceptive. The visibility of libraries in the report stems not so much from the skill of library spokesmen, but rather from recognition by the others that there is something seriously wrong in the world of research libraries, not only in their economic vitality, but in their capacity to meet service obligations.

The remedies prescribed, both in the report of the National Enquiry and in the earlier publication on research universities, are largely library-generated. Our colleagues in other areas accept them, in part because they have some faith in the wisdom of our profession and, also, because the general directions we proclaim have attained the kind of credibility that comes with repetition. The intent of the report was to support those causes that seemed to stand up under careful scrutiny and then to relate these specific recommendations to the general goal of effective scholarly communication. I cannot repeat in full the discussions that took place on each of the library topics, but I want to talk briefly and informally on at least some of the substance of those talks.

First on the list of recommendations is the assertion that a comprehensive bibliographic structure is essential as a foundation for restructuring the process of scholarly communication. Our discussions underscored the fact that the real issue was not with the techniques used by libraries to maintain their own catalogs, but rather with the processes by which scholars identify what books or journal articles have been published or what information has been assembled in other forms that is pertinent to their research. In essence, the call is to devise a realistic basic bibliographic structure, (realistic in both functional and economic terms), for humanistic and historical studies that is, in effect, library-independent. Put

another way, research properly begins by identifying and assessing what has gone on before, and the holdings of even the largest libraries, to which relatively few have access, are often insufficient bases from which to begin. The example of the extensive bibliographic underpinnings of certain of the sciences has not gone unnoticed.

Further, the Enquiry notes that possible new methods of distribution of research results — one or another forum of on-demand publishing, for example — will be absolutely dependent on the quality of the underlying bibliographic machinery.

The Enquiry points to the Bibliographic Services Development Program (BSDP) of the Council on Library Resources (CLR) as one of the efforts now underway to promote the cause of this proposed bibliographic revolution. The first months of work have underscored the difficulty of the enterprise. There are many organizations, libraries, and even individuals with their own important agendas, and voluntary sublimation of those agendas to an as yet poorly defined and unverified higher order of bibliographic control does not come easily.

This is not the place to review the BSDP, but it might be of interest to note that there is already a heavy emphasis on the many matters related to name authority control, especially as that activity relates to distributing responsibility for building bibliographic data bases.

Another activity that might promote progress on this same Enquiry objective is a major analytical effort to assess the technical, economic, and service implications of linking, in some appropriate manner, the data bases of existing bibliographic utilities. The utilities themselves, the Library of Congress, brokers, and a number of libraries have all agreed to provide needed data for the project, which will be completed in March of 1980. The work is being done by Battelle Columbus Laboratories, under BSDP guidance. The project is being monitored by the Program Committee of the BSDP and a CLR committee, specially formed for the purpose.

The second specific recommendation directed to libraries by the Enquiry urges prompt action to establish the periodicals center that librarians have been "backing towards" for almost a decade. The number of permutations on the form such a center might take borders on infinity, and it is not inconceivable that the time will come when a center to house the plans for a center will be required. Late in the 1940's a plan was advanced to build such a facility in Connecticut. This was followed by a counterproposal to substitute a "system" for the center, and for nearly 40 years the debate between the two has swung with the rhythm and predictability of Foucault's pendulum. The Enquiry supports the plan developed last year by a large number of individuals, including the members of an ARL committee, that worked together under the CLR's aegis. The plan was endorsed by the Enquiry because it meets service, preservation, and economic specifications established by research libraries (and thus their scholarly users) while opening reasonable avenues to respond to valid concerns of publishers and others with economic investments. It even offers opportunities for linking in exciting new ways the distribution function of at least some publishers and libraries. It is essential for both libraries and scholars that there be a healthy and dynamic publishing enterprise in this country, just as it is essential to the long-run interests of publishers that libraries be in a position to put their always limited funds to effective use.

There are those who see the concept of a dedicated and comprehensive collection of periodicals as a kind of primitive approach to a problem that can be better solved by computer and communication networks. I wonder at times if this latter approach is not really a status quo solution by a different name, since in its essence such a system simply links in a more expensive way what now exists and depends, in the end, on the maintenance of present effort and the perpetuation of present practices, and widely distributed responsibility without accountability.

The concept of establishing a comprehensive periodicals collection, the existence of which would force each library to rethink its own acquisition, preservation and retention policies and practices, is far more radical. Personally, I would go beyond periodicals in the long run. Creation of national collections of a few specific categories of material (probably material that bulk large, that can be defined as a category with precision, and that offers the prospect of reasonably long-term utility to a widely dispersed body of users) is now a matter of great importance to research universities, their libraries, and scholars.

As you know, bills to establish a periodicals center have finally been introduced in both houses of Congress in recent weeks. They seem to have the support of librarians, university officers, and at least some segments of the scholarly community. The first order of business for those concerned parties should be to press for passage of the legislation, including at least the basic funding required to get the venture underway.

A third specific recommendation of the Enquiry concerns the bête noire of the decade — a national library agency. I will not dwell too long on the topic, but there is, I think, one point that might usefully be made. If the concept of library self-sufficiency is now established as fiction and if research libraries have, in fact, a set of obligations for which they are responsible and accountable collectively rather than individually, (and I will assert parenthetically that the formulation and conduct of an appropriate preservation program, the building and maintenance of primary bibliographic data bases and sophisticated bibliographic products, the building of a periodicals center, the conduct of the research and analysis required on a continuing basis to plot a wise course through an amazing thicket of conflicting self-interests, and participation in the development of a credible voice to articulate the needs of libraries and scholars, are all matters of collective concern), then research libraries as a group need a set of their own employees to do this work. Scholars, librarians, and university officers must at some time build this capacity for action at the inter-institutional level. This is the only way to help shape the future rather than to be shaped by it.

A fourth target of the Enquiry is the preservation of library materials. Like the periodicals center, this has been an agenda item for many years, and one on which progress has been slow. The preservation problem is really two problems, one prospective and one retrospective. Stimulated at least in part by Enquiry emphasis, there is now some specific and promising action to report.

In May, 1979, a group of individuals representing paper manufacturers, publishers, the library world, and others, met at the invitation of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Council on Library Resources to consider ways to press for the use of better paper in book publishing. As a result of that meeting, a committee of six members was established to follow up on several promising

approaches identified during the discussion. The Committee, chaired by Herbert Bailey, is now at work. In a separate undertaking, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) is being encouraged to address the preservation problem, including this prospective aspect, on the international level.

If the present and future pose difficult problems, then the retrospective preservation problems are even more intractable, but there are signs of progress even here. Title II-C of the Higher Education Act has been an important new source of funds, ARL's Office of Management Studies is about to embark on a new program in this area to assist member libraries, and certain national and private funding sources are now fully aware of the dimension of the problem.

But here, too, some basic work needs to be done. The underlying goal to preserve the contents of at least some of the most important segments of the human record cannot be achieved by individual libraries, acting independently. A strategy or plan of action is required, and all we have are tactics. Before a major financial investment is made, the technology to be used must be established, targets must be set, and an accountable body must be designated to do the work. As with so many other things in our lives, we need to seek not utopia, but an acceptable, reasonable course of action.

When the text for Research Universities was drafted in 1976, the first recommendation called for appropriations to carry out the provisions of Title II-C of the Higher Education Act. That, in fact, happened, though never at the authorized level. Now, in this new report, the call is for reauthorization, and hearings are underway. Suffice it to say that humanistic scholarship still relies on purposefully assembled collections focused on specific subjects or areas which are maintained in great depth, and it is to the credit of the authors and administrators of Title II-C that some honest efforts are being made to coordinate collection building efforts.

The final suggestion of the Enquiry concerns the responsibility of librarians to work with users to help assure that proposed changes be both understood in general terms and implemented in appropriate ways. This is a matter of critical importance. What libraries do in the years ahead must improve performance in the eyes of users as well as of our accountants. Scholars must help plot the course. This is a difficult thing to do, but a way must be found. The agenda proposed in the Enquiry was established by a joint effort and essentially the same set of partners will have to find a way to carry it out. In recent years a number of commissions and organizations have pointed the finger in the direction of research libraries and have urged action. That pressure continues, and the focus narrows. At this particular time and for many reasons, I do not think we can, or should, duck.

* * * * * *

References:

[1]Research Universities and the National Interest: A Report from Fifteen University Presidents. (New York: Ford Foundation, 1977.)

DISCUSSION

MS. DUNLAP: This report has some tremendous implications for all of us. I would like to have us spend the next few minutes in raising some of the issues, and our two speakers, I am sure, would be delighted to entertain any specific questions.

MR. GOVAN (North Carolina): My question is directed to Dr. Breneman.

I think we all find the report full of implications for our libraries. However, the timing of it, as far as an academic institution is concerned, is somewhat badly placed. I am wondering, since much of the university community may not be aware of its existence, how we might best get it publicized, and indeed, make use of it on our individual campuses.

MR. BRENEMAN: By the timing, you mean coming out in May?

MR. GOVAN: Yes.

MR. BRENEMAN: We worried a lot about that and tried to get it out just before everybody broke for the summer. We did, of course, get good coverage in The Chronicle of Higher Education.

My sense is that we did as much as we could at that time. What is needed now is another round of commentary. For example, the kind of effort that would be helpful would be to find some clever soul to write a back page article for The Chronicle of Higher Education on the report. The Chronicle is probably one of the best devices to get the word out generally on the university ground. Change magazine is a second device that we have thought about.

Meetings like this are not terribly helpful, as one is talking to the already converted. The American Council on Education (ACE) session, I think, is an important one, because that is primarily a group of university administrators. The problem is that the report will be discussed at one of a number of concurrent sessions, and inevitably the audience will be split.

What is needed is more commentary, and some popular reactions to the report in places where lots of people will see it — I keep coming back to The Chronicle and the idea of a back page piece. I have not really discussed the idea with Robert Lumiansky, President of ACLS, but I am sure The Chronicle would do it. Corbin Gwaltney, the editor, was a member of the Enquiry's Governing Board, and I think it is time this autumn for a second go-round, maybe simply listing some of the things that have already happened. One of the striking features of this report — and I have been associated over the last ten years with more reports than I would care to think about — is that we are riding tides that were already under way; that is always a good thing to do. There are many specifics you can point to already and say "Look, this show is on the road and things are happening."

The makings of a good popular piece are there; that is my main and only idea, I guess, on it. Jim may have some others.

MR. HAAS: Clearly within every university someone is going to have to take initiative. It is not going to happen by accident. I remember back when I had to work for a living as a librarian that library committees seemed to churn on and on over a large number of relatively trivial things. Why not consider beefing up a library committee to include representatives of major faculty components? Pick up an editor or two who happens to be on the campus, a university press person, and dedicate a year to sharpening the understanding of the implications in this area so that at the end of the year you would have a small, well-informed group of people who themselves might become missionaries. Somebody in each institution is going to have to take the lead, or it is just going to drift along.

MR. MCDONALD (Connecticut): I had a question similar to Jim Govan's. Maybe he would agree that part of the question for those of us in publicly supported institutions is not so much convincing persons at our universities as convincing political leaders and those who control the purse strings. Jim Haas's instructions to us, I think, would work well with the people immediately at hand on our own faculties. And, indeed, I am sure some of us have already tried to do what he suggests. But the problem of reaching decision-makers in government is another aspect that maybe David would be willing to comment on.

MR. BRENEMAN: Well, to the extent that this topic — which is not going to be at the top of anybody's hit list or priority list at the either national or state level — can get these ideas percolated out, I have the feeling that a pretty good job has been done at the federal level. The relevant parties in Washington, at both the Congressional staff level and in the Executive Branch, have been apprised of this report and have looked at it and dealt with it.

Now, what I have not thought about much, and maybe I would have to ask you to respond to a question of mine, is exactly what should be addressed directly to the state-level politician or legislator. My emphasis has been so heavily at the federal level that I have not thought about the state level lately. What message is there in this report that you think needs to get filtered out to those state leaders? The process of getting that message out should be to work through university presidents and vice presidents.

MR. MCDONALD: Well, of course, it is easy to ask questions. When the panelists ask them back, it gets tough. I guess I am feeling particularly disadvantaged right now. The state of Connecticut is going through one of its periodic efforts to pretend that it is poor. This capacity for collective actions depends, at least in part, on the financial health of each of the institutions, and I think many of us are experiencing declining financial health that affects our ability to participate in a cooperative effort in a serious way.

That is not a very direct response to what you are saying, David. But I do think that if we are to function effectively in ARL, or if we are to be effective in influencing legislation, we have to have a little more flexibility back home. And I see that flexibility declining.

MR. HAAS: I think you are right. The issues talked about here are really a long-term agenda and the benefits are long-term benefits. The curse of collective action is that it becomes distorted to sharing poverty. And when that happens, you typically end up worse off than better off.

What is required here is understanding in terms of perception. Too often, I suspect, in state budget hassles, the year is the planning zone, not the decade. Articulate spokesmen gradually permeating both universities and the public consciousness is really what are needed.

MR. BRENEMAN: Of course, the main emphasis of some of the recommendations, particularly on the press and journal side, is on various forms of cost savings.

For example, the recent Wesleyan University Press decision to turn over a large part of its noneditorial processes to Columbia University Press seems to me to be not only in the spirit of the Enquiry but in the spirit of the times. The days in which a university can continue to let a small university press operate at a steady drain on the resources of the institution are numbered, and many university presidents are looking around for ways to save a buck. One way would be to follow up on some of the very sensible suggestions in the report for this kind of economies of operation.

So, John, I think in the press and journal areas we are "in sync" with things that are going to happen anyway, and the fact that we have blessed them by this group representing such a broad constituency may just speed those up. However, this does not address some of the concerns of the library community, except maybe indirectly.

MR. SHANK (UCLA): I certainly would hope that one could achieve a number of the objectives of the report on Scholarly Communication. To operate our publishing enterprises more economically and our libraries more economically is absolutely essential. I am really concerned more about the long-range future and am driven to make comments by something that Mr. Banner said last night and something you said this morning, David. It is about libraries as the source of demand. My comment goes a long way back to the man who said "Libraries are a bottomless pit" Libraries are a bottomless pit. Every administrator of a university has said that, I guess. And I realize that we do ask for and spend a lot of money. I assumed that we were doing so as surrogates for the people we serve.

However, the fact of the matter is that it is not really libraries that are a bottomless pit. It is the ability of scholars to think and to write that is the bottomless pit. Should they ever stop thinking and writing, we can stop buying. We do not really provide the demand that keeps university presses and journals in business. We do reflect the interests of our scholars who cannot afford to buy and keep all the journals that they want. In a sense, libraries are agencies which "launder" money from those who support research institutions into the hands of the disciplines, thus allowing scholars to sustain themselves and advance and so forth.

I wonder to what extent the scholarly communities other than physics and perhaps psychology have taken seriously the issue of how they communicate information, how they sustain the advance of the discipline, and the need for change in the communication system. The American Institute of Physics (AIP) did propose a rather grand scheme for communicating; I am not sure how far they were able to get with it because it interfered with the scholars' own sense of how they should practice their disciplines and communicate with each other. They did say, after all, that they were putting up a part of the money to support publications

through the dues they paid to scientific and technical societies. And I assume humanities scholars do the same thing. This, however, is only a small part of the money that is required to sustain publications.

I wonder to what extent the disciplines are studying other ways of communicating. For example, the Royal Society really started "publish or perish" by fining all members of the Society a small amount if they did not publish something during a year; there was a runner who went around to the doors of all the members of the Royal Society asking for the few pence required if they did not publish. How about, instead of "publish or perish," "publish and perish"? That is, if you write and your writings are found to be useless, you lose your head. That is one way of reducing the number of publications that we have to buy.

The question really is: are the disciplines facing this dilemma themselves? Are there better ways to communicate, better ways to judge the capabilities of researchers and measure their contribution to the discipline, etc.?

MR. BRENEMAN: I think that is an extremely good question. You will even find in the brief afterword of the report a skillfully crafted paragraph or so that says that, in a sense, the motivation for publishing and the whole cycle that scholars begin is really at the root of many of these issues; we did not have the opportunity in this Enquiry to probe deeply into this. Although we considered the motivation for publishing an important issue, we did not want to give any support to the notion that simply because something has been written, it necessarily warrants publishing. I think there was some shock value in taking a fairly hard line and not arguing, as I think some of the members of our Board might have either thought we were going to argue or would have wanted us to argue, for some sort of relief subsidies or support for scholarly journals.

Salted through the report you will find a number of caustic comments wondering how valuable all of this scholarly publishing is. And, of course, part of the trouble is the costs of starting a new journal are low. After I had helped write the report and we had as one of our major recommendations that there be no net journal growth — that somehow people face the prospects of letting some publications go by the boards when a new one is added — I received an invitation in South Carolina to become a member of a board of editors of a newly started journal. And, lo and behold, it is true that in my field the editor had found some way to slice things just a little differently, an oblique angle that nobody else was quite hitting. I was full of pious thoughts about, how having just written this report, I should now strike my stance against this irrational proliferation of journals. And yet even having been as aware of it as I was, when all is said and done — what the hell. My protest would go for naught and there was some small marginal benefit and no personal cost of being on that board of editors. So I am on the board of editors; the journal is now going to be hitting your libraries as another claimant for resources.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tell us what the title is so we will be sure not to subscribe to it.

MR. BRENEMAN: You will not believe this. I cannot remember what the title is.

This question really is a problem, a fascinating system of third party costs. As you point out, in a way, libraries are really surrogate; the bill ultimately comes home to tuition-paying students and taxpayers. That is utlimately the source of your revenue.

Of course, where you quickly get into trouble is that people see this as an anti-intellectual spirit. In fact, one of our press editors at Salt Lake City accused the report of having a distinct anti-intellectual tone. I could never quite get him to say what he meant by that, and in fact he denied that it had to do with this particular idea I am discussing, though he never really explained his accusation.

This is an area that the new ACLS committee can begin to address. I think it is a serious issue. I just do not see how the ease of launching a new journal and the expectation that it somehow has a God-given right to exist can go on. We certainly gave no support to that notion, and a more rational balance must be developed.

There are some other specific thoughts collected in the report; for example, the way people are granted tenure or promotion. We suggested that rather than just looking at sheer bulk, one might ask the scholar to submit the one or two items that he or she felt was his or her best work and be evaluated on that, actually have the work read rather than just looking at an annual list. There are some behavioral changes that are imaginable and not totally out of the question.

Somehow ideas like this must penetrate through the awfully slow and torturous process of working through faculty and administrators, and ACLS is the place you have to lodge an initial effort. I hope this will be an issue that the new ACLS/ARL/AAUP committee I mentioned earlier might see fit to take under its wing as a topic for discussion.

MR. HAAS: I think the question of quality control, which is really what Russ Shank is talking about, is something that probably in the end cannot be assigned to any one of the sectors. Publishers would argue that they in fact maintain, through their selection process, a quality control mechanism. But, speaking with pretty clear memories of the '60s and '70s when library book budgets went up and up and up, and we, in a sense, collected compulsively, I would have to say that libraries themselves have a role to play in quality control as well. If you have the money, it is too easy to hide behind the machinery and not say, "This just does not justify space on the shelves"; or, "It makes no sense for this library to have that, when right across town the same thing in large quantity is there." I think the quality control responsibility is one that must be assumed. We spent a great deal of time talking about it and came to no solutions. With David, I think the ACLS committee has a major responsibility here, too.

MR. LORENZ (Association of Research Libraries): The most serious source for the phrase "bottomless pit" that I have heard was about ten years ago when it came out of the then Bureau of the Budget. I am very pleased that I have not heard it out of this present Office of Management and Budget. I hope the phrase has been buried for the time being at least.

I am very pleased that both Dave and Jim focused on the importance of the National Periodicals Center in our future, because it seems to me that this will be the maximum effective use of federal resources. But the bird in the hand that we

have now — and I am glad that Jim spoke to this — is HEA Title II-C, and the future funding of that program will be very important to us also.

I would say that those projects that reflect cooperative planning and maximum use of resources are those that have been most likely to be funded. Nevertheless, since they do come in from individual sources, quite a few of these projects have been different approaches to the same problem, such as building a national serials data base. I was pleased to see that CLR has some plans now to bring together the recipients of funding to build a national serials data base. It seems to me that is a very good move. I wonder if you would say a little bit more about maximizing the use of those grants' resources.

MR. HAAS: This is on building the bibliographic data bases, especially in the CONSER context?

MR. LORENZ: Yes.

MR. HAAS: Title II-C provides substantial amounts of money now to a fairly large number of recipients. Many of these are generating bibliographic records. Some of them apparently are not completely consistent with the CONSER level records, and I think it is important that the records should be consistent. So the Office of Education, the Council, and the CONSER group itself are calling together the recipients, if my memory is right, some time in mid-November, to spend two days trying to capitalize fully on the efforts each of these libraries are putting into generating records, so that those records become, in fact, useful nationally.

A related question, that of location of the material, is also on the agenda. One of the things that has not yet happened here in this country is developing some kind of rational strategy for identifying the location of specific items. What we have now is a kind of random approach where reporting libraries get recorded. In the long run, I suspect a mix of technology and logic might improve the mechanism by which locations are reported and maintained as a part of this nation-wide bibliographic enterprise.

THE LIBRARY CATALOG COST MODEL: A TOOL FOR DECISION MAKERS

Richard W. Boss
Information Systems Consultants, Inc.

MS. DUNLAP: Richard Boss is certainly another person who really does not need to be introduced to this body. He was with us for a number of years in two different capacities, as Director at Tennessee and also as Director at Princeton. In addition to these posts, he has taught at Utah, Western Michigan, Iowa, and Tennessee, and has been a consultant to a list of institutions and organizations longer than both arms; I could not begin to name all of them. He currently is with Information Systems Consultants, Inc. and has been a special consultant on ARL's Library Catalog Cost Model Project.

MR. BOSS (Information Systems Consultants, Inc.): I feel a little bit like a hunter on safari with an empty cartridge case, because the news I bring this morning is that the cost model project is not yet completed. The data, therefore, are not final, and one has to talk in terms of highly tentative conclusions indeed. Nevertheless, let me aim the empty rifle and say "bang, bang" periodically to try to persuade you that there is something tangible and worthy of your attention.

There are computer runs still being done which probably will be completely processed by the end of October or early November, somewhat dependent upon resubmissions from some institutions. The actual data analysis will be undertaken in the month of November and then, hopefully, will be rushed to publication. There are at least three tentative conclusions that one might dare make, however, on the basis of the runs that have been completed and the data which have been gathered. These are:

1. The cost of AACR 2 is less than anticipated.

2. The cost of retaining the card catalog is less than going to either a computer output microform (COM) or an on-line catalog.

3. COM and on-line costs are not significantly different from one another in a number of specific situations which have been analyzed.

Let me dwell a little more on each of these in turn.

It is misleading to say that the costs of AACR 2 are less than anticipated without examining that statement in greater detail and asking when was the anticipating done. Many institutions began to concern themselves with AACR 2 very early on and therefore did analysis, including cost analysis, at a time when the plans of the Library of Congress were not yet firm, and when a great deal of other information was lacking. Therefore, we heard such things as 37% potential conflict between new and established headings. As the result of decisions made at LC and elsewhere, we know that many of the calculations have had to be altered.

Another factor that perhaps caused the AACR 2 impact to be more massive initially was some of the early methodology. When starting research in a new area, there is a learning curve, and the early methodologies have their deficiencies. To

take a week's sample of cataloging and do it using AACR 2, match it against the existing card catalog to determine the rate of conflict, and then project that data 50 weeks ahead can be very misleading. If there are, let us say, 100 headings that are very frequently used — that occur many, many more times than any other headings — the likelihood is that they will show up disproportionately in the first week's sample. If one projects from that, one assumes that those same very voluminous headings are going to continue to be a problem, even though they have already been addressed early on in the post-AACR 2 cataloging.

Nevertheless, the cost of implementing AACR 2 is very great indeed. But it is minimized, perhaps, by the fact that we now have a context in which to put it. We are not talking about the present card catalog versus AACR 2; we are talking about what options, what practical options, there are for a library. One option is using AACR 2 in a card catalog, whether it is unified or split. Another option is COM; a third is on-line. If one looks at those options, then, in the context of the alternatives, AACR 2's impact for the card catalog does not appear to be as massive as when AACR 2 was being examined in isolation at the early stages of some institutions' examination of the problem.

As I said, one of the tentative conclusions that seems to be sustained with data available now is that the cost of retaining the card catalog is less than going to COM or an on-line catalog. Now, some of the premises on which this conclusion is based are somewhat dangerous premises of which everyone should be aware. One premise is that the Cost Model study specifically looked at a five-year time period. What one is really doing is comparing the maintenance of a card catalog over that period of time with the establishment of a new medium. And, especially in the case of on-line, one is talking about including in that five-year period the amortization of a very substantial capital investment. We are also talking about the conversion of files that will only occur once and will be beneficial for many years beyond that five-year period. We have loaded the deck, so to speak, so that we conclude that the card catalog over the next five years, whether it is unified or split, is probably going to be more economical than either COM or on-line. However, this is only if the start-up costs are loaded into that five-year period. If the time period had been longer, different results might have occurred.

Also, the results can be affected by the size of the conversion undertaken. If a library was to undertake only to load OCLC archival tapes or any other tapes of that type it might already have, then the costs charged to either COM or on-line will obviously be less, and the annual cost, if this figure is amortized, will be less in comparison to the card catalog than if a target figure for converting records into machine readable form is set. Many of the institutions participating in the Cost Model project chose to convert 250,000 records from card to machine-readable form. At a cost of conversion, depending upon which alternative one takes, of anywhere from 67 cents to several dollars per record, that obviously begins to very much affect the comparison.

There are so many variables involved that one must be very careful when one says that the cost of retaining the card catalog is less than going to a COM or on-line catalog. I think one probably should actually say the cost of retaining the card catalog is less than going COM or on-line if you adopt the premises of the Cost Model project and the anticipated levels of conversion and size of file of the participants in the Cost Model project.

The third conclusion, that COM or on-line costs are not significantly different in several specific situations, is also affected by a number of things. Most institutions chose to look at the turn-key, on-line, computer-based systems for purposes of cost calculations rather than either using a main frame computer system or rather than doing in-house development of software, which would, of course, tend to increase the cost of the on-line system. Also they tended to look at either in-house or service bureau COM production.

There is yet another option that has emerged which could affect figures in favor of computer output microform: network support of COM. SOLINET decided to offer an option in between the service bureau, which tends to be fairly expensive because it is a for-profit operation, and in-house development, which may or may not be costly, depending upon whether or not the capability already exists on a campus or in some other organization for this type of activity, and depending upon whether or not the price being charged by a campus computing center in fact reflects costs or whether it reflects something substantially less than costs.

SOLINET decided to base a project on the acquisition of the equipment to produce the computer output microform, assuming that they would be sustaining at least 20 COM catalogs. In addition, they calculated that rather than having the independent computer capability in order to manipulate the files and reformat them from the communications format to an operating format, which is necessary for COM production, they would contract with Blackwell North America to have it done there. Based upon all these calculations, SOLINET determined that they could offer the service for about 35% less than any of the existing commercial service bureaus. Their experience to date, now that they are in part operational, shows that they will be able to reduce their prices even further, especially since the number of customers is greater than the 20 on which the cost calculations were based.

There seems to be a general attitude among the bibliographical utilities to let this be a network activity rather than to offer a COM catalog as a bibliographic utility product. At least, that is very much the signal at this point from OCLC, Inc., and there is some thinking along those lines possibly at the Research Libraries Group (RLG). (The attitude of the University of Toronto Library Automation System (UTLAS), is definitely to have this be a bibliographic utility support service, however.) The network approach, if it were duplicated in other parts of the country by other networks, would offer something that would alter the figures that most of the participants in the Cost Model project came up with and might make COM again an attractive alternative.

Given the data that were actually collected in the Cost Model project, it would suggest that for those institutions that are thinking of ultimately going to an on-line catalog, using the COM catalog as an interim would not be advisable. It would be more cost effective and less traumatic to continue with a card catalog in one form or another and then move directly to on-line catalogs at such time as the development has been completed for that alternative catalog mode.

There are some problems with all of this. As I said, the conclusions are tentative because the analysis has not been completed. But even when the analysis is completed during the next couple of weeks, there are still going to be some problems: 1) the reliability of the data, and 2) the reliability of the model. I feel more comfortable talking about one than the other, but let me try to tackle both of them.

The data that were provided in the background paper, that portion of the project for which I had responsibility, are, for the most part, quite old. We set some criteria for utilizing the data, at least we set some criteria at first. We wanted something for which we knew what the methodology for gathering the data had been, so that we could look at that methodology and determine if it was sound. Well, we found that for a number of types of costs in the technical services area, specifically the cataloging area, the only well-documented, methodologically good-quality data we could find were more than a decade old.

So it was then a question of attempting to adjust decade-old information for inflationary trends and then attempting to compare the results with somewhat more crude data that were current. To the extent that reliable data of ten years ago that have been updated and quick-and-dirty in-house studies that are current seem to agree, there was a fairly high confidence level, at least as high as we achieved in this particular project.

But in many cases, we did not even have that to go on. We wound up making a series of telephone calls, saying: "Do you have any data in this area or do you know anyone who does have data in this area?" We considered this a problem from the standpoint of the background paper. But, after all, one of the principal roles of the background paper is to prepare those who are doing the cost models to do the cost modeling. And if the data are 10% off, or 15% off or, 20% off, one is still going to be able to create a reliable model. One can substitute more reliable data at a later time.

We thought such data would be forthcoming from the participants during the course of the project. Well, we should not have been that hopeful. It was pretty obvious very early on that there was going to be a very, very heavy reliance on the default figures; that is, the data provided in the background paper which were in the initial modeling that was done by King Research. Other more reliable data were not forthcoming for several reasons.

One reason is that the participating institutions had not done studies in the past that really could be used in this context. A second reason is that the compressed time schedule of the project was such that the time was not available even if libraries had wanted to do such studies. And, third, an unfortunate but understandable number of libraries had a hesitancy to share data in which there was not a very high level of confidence. It is one thing to have an in-house study, circulated in memorandum form among a limited group of people; it is quite another thing to hang data out as laundry for all of ARL to see. Hence there are a number of references in the background paper and elsewhere in this project to anonymous sources of information.

It became obvious, to the extent that institutions input their own data in the cost models, that there were very, very dramatic differences among figures, with such things as pulling cards — you would think pulling cards from a card catalog would be a fairly straightforward activity — ranging so that one figure would be as high as 370% of another figure. There were, in fact, data submitted by some institutions which were 20 and more times figures for the same activity in another library.

This suggests one of two things. The first is a definitional problem. I think one of the very basic flaws that existed and still exists is a lack of clear definition

for each one of the data elements so that one is really confident that everyone has a common understanding of what it means, for example, to file a catalog card or to edit a record.

The second relates to methodology. How does one actually go about gathering the data? It is quite apparent that the concept of burdened cost, the idea of taking more than just the very direct labor and materials cost of performing an activity, is infrequently used in the academic research library environment. As this kind of burdened cost concept is very basic to the thinking of an organization such as King Research, a classic conflict of perception developed at the first project workshop where there was, at first, a very vigorous attempt on the part of the project director, Robert Wiederkehr, to urge the concept of burdened costs.

There was another problem as well: the problem of actually applying data. One can talk about filing costs and, after finally reconciling all of the different costs of filing that one gets from various sources, it is one thing to apply those filing costs to a unified card catalog; it is quite another thing to apply those very same data to a new card catalog, begun with only new acquisitions, which is a fraction of the size of the old catalog.

One of the things that has happened in this particular cost modeling project is that there is no differentiation made between the use of data in one context and the use of data in another context. All of these problems address what has been hung on this structure, not the structure itself. To the extent that one can later refine data, the structure will continue to serve us very well.

I feel less confident in talking about the structure itself, because the model still is what one has to consider, for want of a better phrase, a crude research model. We are not talking about a polished product that is akin to buying an off-the-shelf turn-key circulation system that has been vended for several years (which, as you know, also tends to have reliability problems). We are talking, instead, about a research model that was developed in a very, very short period of time.

My own sense of it is that the basic model structure is sound, that the elements are here to look at the relationships that exist among the various aspects of cataloging activity and the creation of catalogs. Perhaps some of the model elements may require subsequent redefinition, but the basic structure, I think, is probably going to stand. Some 30 or more institutions, I understand, have obtained the software for in-house manipulation, and thus, further refinement of the research model into an operational model will take place over the next several months. I think it is highly likely that the resultant operational model will look very much like the current research model, even after substantial alteration by as many as 30 institutions. It really is a conceptual structure perspective which tries to impose a discipline not common to librarianship on a library issue, a structure that has already worked in a number of other environments.

I think the big issues are going to be the refinement of data and the refinement of definitions of model elements, rather than an actual rebuilding of the structure itself. My sense is that it is doubtful that there will be a dramatic change in the generalizations, even given more refined data or more refined model definitions. A card catalog, an on-line catalog, a COM catalog, a catalog in any

form, is a highly expensive thing, and, depending on the way one manipulates the figures and the assumptions you use, you may produce variances that will make one option less expensive than the other two. But the degree of difference is not going to be so great as to create an imperative for choosing one or the other format.

Therefore, the non-cost considerations have, in my opinion, emerged as being equally, if not more, important than the cost considerations when it comes to the form of the catalog. This means that one has to look at the attitudes of staff and of those served with regard to that catalog and with regard to the traumas that may be associated with a change in catalog format. One also has to look in terms of the actual service that is provided to the users of a library. My own bias is that the potential of the on-line catalog is greatest in this regard because of the power of searching and the speed of that searching as compared with any other form.

One of the things that we were able to determine in preparing the background study was the time it takes to search a card catalog, a COM catalog, and an on-line catalog, although the on-line catalog data have the least dependability. There is no question that one realizes speeds of three and more times as fast using on-line searching, and that on-line searching is more effective.

The on-line catalog also offers the ability to escape the rigidity of the cataloging code. There is no way to escape the rigidity of the cataloging code in a card catalog; it can be done in an on-line catalog that is properly constructed. If someone uses the wrong heading, the linkage to the right heading will be made in the system and the information sought will be displayed, rather than a cross-reference that implies "You dummy, you didn't look under what we put it under."

This kind of development toward the on-line catalog, even if it is everyone's ideal — and, in polling the study participants at the first workshop, it certainly seemed that this was the long-term ideal of virtually every institution represented — still does not result in a definite shift toward on-line catalogs because of the many obstacles that remain. The fact is that the turn-key vendors still have not demonstrated working on-line catalogs. The turn-key on-line system vendors, when polled during the past week, projected March 1980 as the earliest date for an on-line catalog that has all forms of access, including subject access, offered by a commercial vendor, and that on-line catalog will probably be something less than what librarians want for their libraries. (You are probably all aware that on-line access including author, title, and call number, is already in place at some institutions, and on-line access with all elements is in place at some institutions on a very, very small scale.)

The bibliographic utilities have not quite made their decisions yet. There seems to be a move toward distributed systems, the notion that there will be a front end in the library which will support local activities such as an on-line catalog, a circulation system, and certain other types of activities, with reliance on the large main frame computers of the utility for cataloging and other shared activities, and for access to the large comprehensive data base with full bibliographic records. As to how they will approach producing these on-line systems, the philosophy seems to vary from, in the case of UTLAS, constructing its own and selling it, to the case of OCLC, which will apparently go out and acquire, if possible, one of the turn-key on-line circulation system vendors, modify the system

to accommodate an on-line catalog and the other local functions, and place it in various libraries around the country, charging the libraries transaction fees similar to the FTU charges for cataloging activities. In the case of WLN, the attitude seems to be one of providing interface with a library-selected system, provided that the system is one of a very limited number for which WLN has committed an interface. In the case of RLG's RLIN, the thinking has not yet gelled to the point of really specifying which approach will be taken to what will probably be a distributed system of some kind.

Of course, if one is in the market for in-house development, many of the libraries represented here exceed the capacities of the mini-computer systems that are on the market today. However, the 4331 IBM, which is a large computer by any measure, has recently been introduced. It is a main frame computer by definition, but it has more of the characteristics of the mini-computer in that it does not require special computer room facilities and it is somewhat simpler to program than the larger IBM main frames which exist in our campus computing facilities or other supporting organizations' computer facilities. But deliveries of those are not easy to come by, what with a backlog of 20,000-plus orders. So it is likely that if you make the decision today, you will be awaiting your equipment for two or three years. One of the early orderers, you may be aware, is Northwestern, which hopes to make its 4331 installation late this year and may be the first to realize an on-line catalog using one of these small main frame computers.

Given all of these things that are out there in one stage of development or another, it suggests that there is going to be considerable cautious watching on the parts of many institutions before there will be a dramatic movement among the American research library community as a whole to on-line catalogs.

I think the most significant contribution that the Cost Model project has made, providing the early tentative conclusions hold up, is to say that one can really wait it out until there is a viable set of options for an on-line catalog available — possibly some two to three years down the road — without losing one's shirt; that is, the card catalog can be sustained in a reconstituted form, whether as a unified card catalog or a split card catalog. Assuming you are prepared to make large numbers of linkages and not undertake all of the headings changes, you can do it without investing substantially more than you would invest in an interim COM catalog as an alternative.

There is another dimension of this that should be addressed, and that is the notion of the cooperative study process itself as an alternative to individual in-house studies. For all its defects — and I think that the sensitivity to the defects is probably greatest within King Research itself — this project still represents an effort that no institution could have achieved on its own, even with more time, with the kinds of costs that were involved. It is an alternative to in-house studies that has not really been tried on this scale before, and I think it may have some real potential for the future in terms of other issues that are of common concern to a number, if not all, of ARL libraries.

I think also that the concept of having a structure on which to "hang" information, which begins to relate these disparate elements to one another and offers a systematic approach to analysis that is somewhat disciplined and objective, is something that can have transfer value for other types of problems as well. It is

a methodology that is valuable not only for future cooperative ventures, but also for undertakings within a library.

This effort tells us that we desperately need a collection of usable, up-to-date data about library activities. When one is scrambling around looking for data and one finds that the data are ten years old and that one cannot put together data that will really make it possible for one to proceed with confidence, that is a problem. I am sure many of you recall — many of you without any pleasure at all — Fritz Machlup's comments in the AAUP Bulletin[1] two or three years ago lamenting the lack of data that librarians had available about their libraries. I recently heard another version of that lament from a major American foundation which was attempting to make a decision with regard to funding of some library activities and found that the kinds of data they wanted were just not available to them. They began to muse that maybe they ought to spend their money to put some data together instead of spending money on representations about what is believed to be the data. And that leads me to this conclusion: given the fact that lack of data is a common concern, not only of academic library directors and their staffs, but also of those who work with libraries outside the field of librarianship, one of the things that the Association might consider is some kind of clearinghouse for research library data or some kind of collecting mechanism for research library data. (SPEC, of course, is a wonderful program in itself, but it is the kind of program that only gathers data retrospectively in specific areas at periodic intervals; it is not a comprehensive, ongoing program.)

The very fact that there are foundations who feel that their own decisions — when they have to make, in some cases, multi-million-dollar decisions about commitments for programmatic support for libraries — would be strengthened by better data might make these foundations sensitive to underwriting such a type of effort. I think that the time is particularly sound now as the foundations are beginning to shift their thinking more and more from the granting of monies to individual institutions to the granting of monies to groupings of libraries to address problems of librarianship, especially of academic research librarianship, on a national level rather than in a number of different local settings.

To the extent that you have questions or comments that dwell on the background paper, I will try to cope as best I can. To the extent that you have comments or questions about the model, I can assure you of objectivity but not always of thorough knowledge. However, I will do my best in that regard also.

* * * * * *

References:

[1]Fritz Machlup. "Our Libraries: Can We Measure Their Holdings and Acquisitions," AAUP Bulletin 62 (October 1976): 303-307.

DISCUSSION

MR. ROSENTHAL (University of California, Berkeley): It occurred to me while you were speaking, Dick, that some kind of post-analysis of the collected data might be helpful, and I wondered whether such an analysis has been contemplated, for example, that might be of use to libraries and library administrations in budgeting. Would it be possible to say that for various types of libraries, the costs of going COM or on-line would be x percentage of total library budgets? Or the cost of maintaining a card catalog would fall in a certain range?

MR. BOSS: There will be considerable post-analysis. I cannot answer whether the specific examples you cited would be included. What I would hope, however, is that the raw data would be available for either independent analysis by anyone who acquires the report or, for that matter, by the Association or by anyone designated by the Association. Carol Mandel may have some additional insights about this.

MS. MANDEL (Association of Research Libraries): The raw data will not be in the report, except in aggregate form or as it is broken down in the data analysis, because we do not feel that we can give out an individual library's data. If somebody needed to do additional data analysis and wanted access to the raw data, I am sure we could make such arrangements. Each library will have its own data; in order to get other libraries' raw data, we would have to begin making special arrangements, and we have not as yet.

MR. BOSS: I think Joe makes a very important point. One of the natural questions to ask is what kind of correlation is there between certain data elements and, for example, the size of the library; whether it is a publicly supported or privately supported institution; whether it is a library of narrow academic focus or one, as often state universities are, that is spread across 130 disciplines, trying to be all things to all people. Do these factors make a difference in the cost? I can say with confidence that the scope of the King effort does not include that type of analysis and that it is going to take working with that raw data by arrangement with the ARL office to get that kind of conclusion.

One of the things that I think can be done fairly simply is to tabulate the areas in which data are most needed, areas where there is either no data or where data are seriously in conflict. You might even in conversation find a volunteer for that kind of activity.

MS. DUNLAP: We look forward very much to the final report, and we are indeed most grateful to you for taking time to come. Thank you very much.

SPECIAL ADDRESS

RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND THE HUMANITIES

James M. Banner, Jr.
American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities

A year ago, the organization that I represent before you this evening did not exist. That I have been asked to speak tonight I take to be a sign that the efforts of the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities (AAAH) to create some new capacities and resources for the humanities in the United States are being recognized already, after only nine months, to hold out a new promise for the world of culture of which we are all a part. I wish to speak with you tonight about those undertakings and about what they hold out for our respective, our kindred, professional work. I want also to reflect upon some issues that affect our work and to propose some departures for us to consider.

For the humanities, the time has come to write finis to what, since at least 1945, has become the customary ways of doing things. Those ways were academic almost exclusively. The humanities focused upon the perfection of teaching and scholarship in the colleges and universities of the nation, and they succeeded spectacularly. Never before has a single nation offered so much high quality instruction in the humanities to so many people and produced so many brilliant and formative contributions to our understanding of the life of human civilization on earth. Yet not until very late — one is tempted to say, not before it was too late — did it occur to us that the conditions that led to this flowing of the humanities were almost entirely extrinsic and, by their very nature, temporary. The prosperity of humanistic teaching and learning, as we now well know, arose from a demographic bulge; from the cultural and ideological challenge of the East; from general economic growth; and from the post-war continuance of New Deal attitudes which supported such programs as a G.I. Bill, the construction of new educational facilities, the purchase of new libraries, foreign-language instruction, and higher compensation for faculty members. These conditions, at least all together, could not last. They did not. And we were not prepared for their disappearance.

Nor could we forsee some of the ill consequences of the prosperity which the humanities enjoyed. Knowledge increasingly became splintered, and each sub-field institutionalized itself. Humanists immersed themselves within the academy and cut themselves off from the invigorating challenge of the larger world. And humanists — those of us who make some sort of profession of engagement with the deepest currents of civilization and yet set ourselves apart to evaluate, clarify, and criticize the products of human agency in the world — we humanists got used to riding high. We became accustomed to being esteemed for our wisdom, when it was usually only knowledge that we possessed. And we got used to being consulted, which put at risk our necessary disengagement from the world.

And now is the time of reckoning. The humanities are out of favor. Prosperity has passed. Vocationalism is in the saddle. Even our most promising young students cannot find suitable employment. The external conditions of our

professional world have changed, and we are struggling to get our bearings. The reason is largely that we failed for too long to examine the intrinsic conditions of the humanities and to be alert to their shortcomings. As we became increasingly isolated, at least intellectually, in the bracing atmosphere of our academic fastness, we failed to notice that the humanities had become overly dependent upon highly specialized institutions (such as liberal arts colleges and foundations), themselves struggling for survival; that they had established little rapport with the citizenry beyond the college years; that they had developed no method of carrying forth to the public word of their great achievements; and, of course, that they had become hopelessly fragmented, overspecialized, technical, recondite — that is to say, irrelevant to a good part of the world's concerns.

It would be possible, I concede, to leave off here, to say to you: well, the humanities missed their opportunity. They deserve their plight. The world will be worse off, of course, but the world has never been grateful for the high and noble attainments of humanistic pursuits, so we leave the world to suffer for its ingratitude. What is more, that humanists are demoralized and unmoored from the comfort of past certainty and security serves them right for their short-sightedness. The marketplace of culture, as well as of jobs, has its own remorseless logic; if the humanities are unsung now, their day may come again.

Fortunately, I do not have to make those concessions, because the world of humanists is astir. It is late, perhaps too late, for these stirrings to have much effect. Perhaps we are responding too much to today's predicaments and not examining tomorrow's. Nevertheless, there are signs — in my estimation, strong signs — of the maturation of the humanities in the United States. I use "maturation" carefully, and in a frankly normative sense. The humanities are today putting behind them their youth, which was characterized by excessive dependence upon others, especially the colleges and universities of the land, themselves in great difficulty. We are seeing the filling in of the institutional structure of the humanities in the United States independent of the institutions which have disproportionately sheltered and nourished them.

What do I have in mind? First, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) is trying to substitute for regular foundation benefactions, soon to cease, a permanent endowment secured from the Congress. If successful, the humanities will have an independent, national institution equivalent to the National Academy of Sciences, with a federal charter and the funds to support its essential work in the production and dissemination of scholarly knowledge. Second, in the National Humanities Center at Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, the humanities at last have their own institute for advanced study — again, autonomously incorporated and, soon it is hoped, handsomely endowed. Finally, the organization I represent is seeking to create a general membership which will carry out some fresh initiatives in, and in behalf of, the humanities.

What is the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities? It differs from existing organizations serving the humanities in not being a government agency (like the National Endowment for the Humanities), nor a learned society in a single field (like the Modern Language Association), nor a society of elected fellows (like the American Academy of Arts and Sciences), nor a research institute (like the National Humanities Center), nor a federation of other associations (like the ACLS), nor an organization for people in a limited section of

the humanities (such as the academy alone). Instead, it is a membership organization for anyone and everyone concerned about the humanities, wherever they may be sought and practiced: in the schools, colleges, and universities; in the public area (such as before education agencies in the states); and in conjunction with the private sector. In addition, it is attempting to accomplish some things which have simply never been undertaken by humanists or in behalf of the humanities: to provide objective and independent news coverage of the humanities, both for practicing humanists and the general public; to create a journalism in the humanities for the general public; to increase the commitment of American corporations directly to the humanities (in ways analogous to their contributions to the arts); and, perhaps most important, to get individual humanists in the many fragmented disciplines to talk with each other, explore common concerns, and learn more about the world of ideas and learning of which they are a part — whatever they do and wherever they may be.

This is a tall order, perhaps too tall. I harbor no illusions about the difficulties faced in trying to do these things. Yet I am convinced that they must be attempted. If not, in this factured and increasingly austere world, the humanities will soon be in deep trouble. And it should be said that existing organizations, which merit more celebration than most humanists are wont to give anything, do not have the resources and do not wish to adopt the mission which the AAAH has taken on.

The AAAH must therefore assume many responsibilities. It will encourage scholarship and teaching. It will attempt to rally and to focus public support for the humanities. It will, above all, try to awaken a sense of common purpose among all people involved with or concerned about the humanities. It will try to refresh the spirit of all of us who, like you and I, serve in our various ways the world's culture.

One of the specific responsibilities all humanists bear — and which the AAAH means to take up — is an obligation to support the nation's libraries.

As in so many other areas, humanists have long taken for granted the great research libraries of this country. Your libraries are among the greatest repositories of knowledge anywhere in the world; and, as custodians of the world's knowledge and wisdom, both ancient and modern, you and your libraries are indispensable to the work of humanists, to say nothing of scientists and others. Without you, quite simply, the humanities as we know them would scarcely exist.

And yet collectively, humanists have done comparatively little to support the research libraries upon which they depend. They have left that task, by and large, to you — occasionally, as I shall argue shortly, to the potential detriment of the humanities. No greater evidence of our inattentiveness exists than the near catastrophe of the New York Public Library earlier in the decade. When its building was deteriorating, its great catalogue crumbling, its collections under threat from misuse, age, and atmospheric pollution, where were the voices of the scholarly societies, where the intervention of the thousands upon thousands of professional humanities who have almost lived at that library, where the collective support of the community for whom the Library's collections are indispensable? They were not to be heard. It was as near to being a scandalous dereliction of professional responsibility as I can conceive. And if the AAAH lives up to its promise, that will not happen again.

In that case, and the second which I will shortly cite, had the nation's research libraries sought the collective help of the humanities, it would have been difficult to find it. For except for the ACLS, there existed no general organization for the humanities; and the ACLS was not favorably equipped to lead its constituent organizations to rouse their own members. You might have sought the assistance of the humanities, but you would have been hard put to gain it.

In the second instance, you have purposefully not sought out the humanities; yet the inability of the humanities to respond to a genuine threat posed by your actions is evidence again of our own neglect as much as of yours. I refer, of course, to plans for a National Periodicals Center.

There is no need for me to rehearse before you the prospective advantages and disadvantages of the Center's vexed plans. The burden of periodicals upon your own libraries is undeniable and must be conceded. The new copyright law poses both problems and opportunities; and a National Periodicals Center would help meet both. The problem is the threat which the Center is very likely to pose to low circulation journals in the humanities.

In seeking general solutions to large problems, plans for the Center have been insensitive to differences among journal users, differences among journal subscribers, and differences among journal advertisers. Many small journals in the humanities will be grievously threatened by the loss of 100 or 200 library subscriptions should libraries seek to depend on NPC to carry the journals' subscription, rather than subscribing themselves. Recovery of lost subscriptions by increased subscription rates to individuals will only compound the problem. Recovery of lost revenue by increased advertising rates will be of little avail, for advertisers are often nonprofit publishers and not, as in scientific journals, for-profit corporations. Few institutions besides research libraries subscribe to these journals anyway. And if these threats materialize and many journals must cease publication, many fields of humanistic scholarship will be injured and the production of knowledge diminished — at the very time that humanists more than ever are publishing their work in periodicals and are increasingly finding book-length manuscripts difficult to place.

What is to be done? Norman Fiering, director of publications at the Institute of Early American History and Culture in Williamsburg, has proposed that some means be found to keep the NPC from providing humanities journals or their contents to libraries or other users until five years after publication — in effect making the NPC only a backlist source for humanities journals. That idea has some merit — as does a lasso upon a horse long after it has gotten loose. It may be a corrective but it does not, and is not meant to, reach to what I believe is the heart of the problem: not how to solve this problem, but how to prevent future ones like it.

Some way must be found for us to explore mutual concerns and to enable us to share these concerns with, and seek the advice and help of, our members long before they become critical problems like those of the New York Public Library and the National Periodicals Center. We need to bring into being a mechanism for continuing formal communications between research libraries and the humanities community. I propose therefore that the Association of Research Libraries, the American Association for the Advancement of the Humanities, and the Independent

Research Libraries Association create a joint committee to serve this function and that its members review with each other on a continuing basis the planned initiatives of their respective communities and seek solutions to problems which they may encounter. Among the issues which such a committee might immediately address are the National Periodicals Center and the threat to the physical condition of the nation's vast treasure of library collections.

What is at stake, of course, is not our two organizations, but rather the very foundations of our intellectual culture and our access to knowledge. As the creators, agents, and guardians of knowledge, we have a special responsibility to work together for the best interests of the nation and its citizens. The challenges are great, but so, too, I know, is our dedication and will. I hope that our work can go forward in concert. The research libraries of the nation will benefit. And so will the humanities.

BUSINESS MEETING

Announcement of New Vice President/President-Elect

MR. ANDERSON: It is my pleasure to announce the results of the election at the Board of Directors meeting yesterday for Vice President/President-Elect. Would the new Vice President/President-Elect please stand. (Mr. Lucker rose.) Jay Lucker.

Election of Board Members

MR. ANDERSON: According to the ARL Bylaws, Article IV, it shall be the duty of the Nominating Committee to select annually as many nominees for the Board of Directors as there are vacancies on the Board to fill. The Chair of this Committee is the Vice President. You have all received the names of the nominees 30 days in advance of this meeting. Would you complete the report, Connie?

MS. DUNLAP: The Nominating Committee has proposed the following slate for your approval: Millicent Abell from the University of California, San Diego; Charles Churchwell from Washington University in St. Louis; and Eldred Smith from the University of Minnesota.

MR. ANDERSON: Would those persons stand? The Bylaws permit nominations from the floor. Are there any further nominations for the three-year term on the Board of Directors? Hearing none, what is your pleasure?

MS. DUNLAP: Elect them by acclamation.

MR. ANDERSON: Is there a motion to accept the slate by acclamation?

MR. JACKSON (Indiana): I so move.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Jackson. Is there a second?

A MEMBER: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: All in favor say "aye". Contrary, "nay". (The motion passed). So ordered. We have three new members of the Board: Millicent Abell, Charles Churchwell, and Eldred Smith.

Report of the Executive Director

MR. LORENZ: On the Washington scene, or Disneyland East, as some people call it, I have seen many congressmen and Congresses in my last 24 years in Washington, but this one seems to me to be the most frenetic. If there is such a thing as a collective nervous breakdown, I think this Congress may be having one.

As you know, the congressional salary issue has now been resolved, but the abortion issue has just been postponed for another several months. But out of it all, at this point, the good news is that another $6 million for the Higher Education Act

(HEA) Title II-C for fiscal 1980 is now solidly in place. And the better news for the future is that we have built a very good base of experience and have established a good record with the Administration in the implementation of the grants that have been made under Title II-C. As a result, there is very good reason to believe that the Administration's budget recommendation for Title II-C for the 1981 budget, and perhaps for future years, will be substantially higher than $6 million. It seems to me that in these times, with the economic pressures, if this can be achieved in the 1981 budget, it will indeed be a major accomplishment. I believe it will be very worthwhile concentrating on all of HEA Title II and the appropriations thereunder in the next session of Congress.

Less certain at this time is the future of the new Title II-D of the Higher Education Act reauthorization providing for a National Periodicals Center (NPC). The new legislation, as you know, has been approved by the House Education and Labor Committee, which is a big step forward, and this legislation is now before Senator Pell's Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities. The Senator, however, indicated very clearly during the hearings that he wants to wait and see what the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services has to say on a National Periodicals Center before his committee acts. And, of course, as many of you know, what will come out of the White House Conference is still very uncertain.

It seems to me that what transpires in the congressional hearing that Senator Pell and Representative Ford of the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education hold during the White House Conference could be very important to what Senator Pell chooses to do with the National Periodicals Center in the future. Unfortunately, we do not know what the format of that hearing is going to be, who will testify, or just how it will be organized. But we should all be watching very closely, those of us who are at the Conference, to see that good testimony on the National Periodicals Center is presented.

In the professional discussions on NPC — and I give this to you as kind of a footnote — and in the presentations to congressional committees, I believe it has become quite clear that whereas compromise and accommodation may be reached with the Association of American Publishers (AAP), the Information Industry Association (IIA) is not likely to agree with any compromise. IIA will continue to consider information as an economic commodity which should be paid for by those who need it and can afford it, and that government support for information services is in direct competition with their free private enterprise.

In a way, the same struggle is taking place over the future of Title 44 to improve the publication, bibliographic control, and the distribution of public documents. A revised bill known as the National Publications Act, which would establish a National Publications Agency, is now before the Congress. But, again, there is not likely to be any definitive action before the 1980 session of Congress.

One definite action which this Congress did take, as you have probably read, was the establishment of a new Department of Education under a new Secretary of Education, which is to come into being in the very near future. There is concern that in the Conference Committee Report on this legislation the new Secretary is given authority to consolidate, alter, or discontinue certain present entities, including the present Office of Libraries and Learning Resources. This could well be of concern to ARL and other library associations.

Other legislation also before the Congress is the reauthorization of the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities. Is Margaret Child with us at this point? Margaret, would you like to comment on where this legislation stands in the present Congress, and anything you might say about appropriations for 1980?

MS. CHILD (National Endowment for the Humanities): First of all, I wanted to thank those of you who responded to my invitation to communicate some of your ideas to Chairman Duffy last spring. We did get a number, a substantial number, of very, very useful letters, and I have reason to believe that Mr. Duffy read them all, because some of the statements that appeared in that onslaught of correspondence turned up in our reauthorization request when it went on to Congress. The Senate hearings were held in June and were virtually without incident as far as the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) was concerned. The reauthorization request is available, if any of you are interested in reading it. You can get it by writing to the Chairman's office or to our Public Affairs Office. It is an interesting document, I think, from your point of view, because there is a great deal in there about the underlying function of research libraries and their importance to the humanities and to humanistic scholarship.

This concern for the perpetuation of your function of serving humanistic scholars was also exemplified in our budget request development for fiscal 1980 and then again for 1981. And, although the President's budget request for fiscal '81 will not go over to the Hill until January, we are very hopeful that there will be included in it a request for a new program initiative at the Endowment specifically directed at conservation and preservation problems. I think that this was at least in part due to the fact that a number of you, in writing to Mr. Duffy, stressed the importance of beginning to make some attack on this problem which unfortunately, afflicts all of your collections.

As to the funding situation, I just do not know quite where we are. I know I am still being paid. But other than that, our fiscal 1980 appropriation is in the rather muddled scene up on the Hill: I think we are operating at the moment under a continuing resolution, but I would not swear to that.

The funding for the Research Collections Program, which has just been renamed the Division of Research Programs (we will have new guidelines out at the end of the month reflecting the somewhat different organization) is going to be about the same in this coming fiscal year. My program — we are now called Research Resources — is a component of the new Division of Research Programs. There will be a little extra money again available, as there was last year; ARL managed to leap in there and grab most of it with two grants, one for the Bibliographic Control of Microforms Project and the other, the preservation and conservation self-study package. We will have about the same amount of funding available this coming year.

Because of the limited amount of money available, we will be unable to make grants which will attack conservation and preservation problems in individual institutions. We are looking for proposals which will have a multiplier effect, bringing together a number of institutions in a city, for instance, to develop a joint disaster plan, training programs, workshops on preventive preservation measures, etc. I have some language printed up on a flyer and any of you who are interested

in what we are doing in this area can write or call; I would be happy to send information to any of you.

I will just simply say one more thing. Stephen Goodell, of NEH's Challenge Grant Program, and I sat down the other day and went through the list of ARL members and the list of institutions which have received Challenge Grants. As you know, the Challenge Grant Program has a one-grant-per-institution limit at the present time. (This may change after reauthorization. If any of you have strong feelings on the subject, again I am sure that the administration of the Endowment and Congress would be interested in hearing your opinions.) However, 54 universities whose libraries belong to this Association have not applied for or have not received Challenge Grants. A few of you may have been turned down, but you can always try again. That is about half the membership of the Association and, as I think we have mentioned in the past, it is an opportunity for libraries to get funding for things NEH does not make available in any other way: very basic costs such as money for acquisitions, renovation, some construction for setting up conservation and preservation labs, etc. Very, very basic. The number of you who have successfully applied to this program, I am sure, would be able to share your experience with the rest. We would be very happy to hear from you.

MR. LORENZ: Do any of you have any questions for Margaret? She has been very straightforward with us, and we thank her very much. We do appreciate those two grants to the ARL. Thank you very much, Margaret.

On copyright, I have no new major significant information to give you. Again my impression is that copyright seems to be working out pretty well, with no major complaints from any source. I understand that even the Copyright Clearance Center is now beginning to make royalty payments to its members, and they are probably very pleased with that.

The Copyright Office is still discussing and working on the five-year study of library photocopying, but they still have not resolved the methodology or the process. We are continuing to monitor, however, everything that is done and will keep you informed if there is any significant development along those lines.

Are there any questions on anything that has been presented so far in terms of legislation or other Washington-based developments?

You will be hearing more later from Bill Welsh and possibly Lee Anderson about the visit last month to some of China's principal academic libraries. From the point of view of the Center for Chinese Research Materials — and I believe from all other points of view — this was a highly successful visit. For the Center, there was the identification of source material published over the last 30 years about which little or nothing was known, and there are certainly new and improved opportunities for the exchange of current and retrospective publications, including the microfilming by the Chinese of important but scarce source materials. The information learned on this visit should be the basis for good discussion at the next meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Center so that this information can be best applied to the future program and publication plans of the Center. The China trip was, in short, a fruitful and worthwhile experience.

But then, the last three-and-a-half years at ARL have generally been for me a series of good experiences. I have been particularly pleased with the progress of

federal grants for research libraries and the over-all progress and growth of the programs of the Association, including the Office of Management Studies, the Center for Chinese Research Materials, and the services of the central office.

However, after more than 40 years of full-time library service, 1980 did seem like a good time to begin to implement some of my own plans for a little less pressure and a little more time to do what I want to do when I want to do it. And so far in 1980, I expect this to include a visit to Florida in January, Louisiana in February, becoming a grandfather late in February (I thought that was pretty good timing), a three-month consulting assignment in Indonesia this spring, some teaching at Catholic University this summer, participating in the IFLA Conference in the Philippines in August, with some travel to Australia and New Zealand thereafter.

MS. DUNLAP: I thought you were going to retire.

MR. LORENZ: It sounds to me like a pretty good schedule.

MS. DUNLAP: You had better slow down.

(Laughter.)

MR. LORENZ: Well, I'll put a little tennis in between there too.

I again want to express my appreciation to the membership and to the staff for the great assistance and cooperation I have received over the years, and I am glad to say this is not goodbye but, rather, I'll be seeing you. Thank you very much.

Report of the Committee on Interlibrary Loan

MR. LUCKER (M.I.T.): This will be very brief. We have, as you know, been working on a revision of the National Interlibrary Loan Code; I spoke briefly at the May meeting in Cambridge on what we were doing. At the ALA meeting in Dallas in June we had an open forum on the proposed draft code, filled a very large size room, and had a good two-hour meeting. We have just completed the transcription of that meeting. In addition, I have been receiving, as requested, comments from ARL libraries, from both directors and interlibrary loan staffs, on specific aspects of the code.

Overall, the general response to the draft code has been very favorable. Everybody seems pleased with the changes and with the overall context of the Code; we see no major difficulties in proceeding with a final draft at this Midwinter Meeting of ALA. I will report quickly on some of the comments we have received and what I think will happen to them.

One important change that was made in the code — and this was a comment that Vern Pings made here last year — is that we are going to change one of the philosophical statements that refers to interlibrary loan as a privilege and not a right. We will say it is neither, but somehow define the necessity of interlibrary loan as a part of library service, rather than getting into this hair-splitting distinction about which of these two things it is.

It has been suggested that something in the code refer to the application of U.S. copyright law to non-U.S. libraries. We will probably not do anything about that since this is a U.S. national interlibrary loan code.

But what we will do as the second part of this project, in which I hope not to be involved, will be the revision of the Interlibrary Loan Manual. I have proposed that we have a statement in the manual about the applicability of copyright laws, particularly to Canadian libraries.

A number of suggestions have been made about the problem with the code and mechanized interlibrary loan systems, particularly OCLC. One general problem is response to reasons for not being able to fill a request. Well, rather than change the Code, we are going to change OCLC, if that is possible. We have at least general agreement from OCLC that they will incorporate into the system a mechanism whereby libraries can respond on-line to the requesting library as to the reason for not being able to fill a request. This is one of the outcomes of the Code that will not be actually reflected in the Code.

There is a particular problem, which we have not yet resolved, having to do with the security of materials in transit. This may be an insoluble problem. The question is which library is responsible for the material once it leaves the lending library. Since there is nobody here from the U.S. Postal Service, what we are really talking about is what happens when the Post Office loses something. Who is responsible? We know that once an item gets to the borrowing library, and until they ship it back, they — the borrowers — are responsible. It is the in-transit responsibility that we have still yet to define.

These are most of the comments we got from ARL libraries. The only other comment that I received came from a non-ARL library and has to do with the matter of what we call nominal costs. As you know, we have recommended that in the Code that the lending library absorb nominal costs of mailing. We also assume that the borrowing library will absorb the cost of returning. There needs to be some definition of what "nominal costs" are. Postage, to some libraries, is not nominal any more. Those libraries that are insuring materials have pointed out that insurance costs are not nominal any more, either.

Thus we may have to redefine what "nominal costs" means. But, other than that, I think that we have pretty well established a reasonable basis of acceptance. If you or any of your staff have any more comments to make, I will be happy to receive them until approximately the middle of January when we go for the final version at the ALA Midwinter Meeting.

Admission of New Members

MR. ANDERSON: A letter of interest in membership was received from the University of Saskatchewan some weeks ago. In the normal process of review, the staff evaluated the credentials presented according to our existing criteria. The Membership Committee, consisting of the Executive Committee, reviewed the papers.

The recommendation from the Executive Committee to the Board was to invite the University of Saskatchewan to become a member of ARL. The Board

subsequently reviewed the credentials and concurred, and we bring to the membership now, in accordance with the Bylaws, a recommendation to invite the University of Saskatchewan to membership in the Association of Research Libraries.

What is your pleasure? A motion is in order.

A MEMBER: I so move.

MR. ANDERSON: A motion has been made to invite the University of Saskatchewan. Is there a second?

MR. JACKSON: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: Do you wish to discuss the motion? All those in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye." Contrary, "nay." (The motion passed.) So ordered. I assume the staff will issue the invitation.

Report of the Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria

MR. ANDERSON: Some weeks ago I appointed a Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria. The work of this group is well under way and they have devised some new approaches to the quantitative criteria. We would like to give you a progress report on their work at this time. The chair of the task force is Jay Lucker.

MR. LUCKER: It was more than some weeks ago; in fact, it was after the May meeting that Lee appointed the task force. The other two members are William Studer from Ohio State and James Wyatt from Alabama.

We decided that because of our mission, which was to consider possible new means for determining eligibility for membership, referring specifically to the new methods of statistics being used by the Task Force on ARL Statistics, we would invite Richard Talbot, who is chairman of that task force, to meet with us and essentially become a member of the Committee, which he did. Carol Mandel has been serving as the staff liaison.

We were given a charge by the President to look at four things:

1. The present quantitative criteria permit admission of academic libraries which are considerably smaller than any of the present members, thereby lowering the median figures each year. The Task Force should consider ways to slow or stop this trend: for example, raising the percentage of the medians required, basing requirements on the medians of older members only, restricting the number of members added each year or every two years.

2. The Task Force on ARL Statistics has been working to develop an index measure for research libraries. The Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria should seriously consider using this index in the membership criteria and should meet jointly with the Task Force on ARL Statistics to discuss the quantitative criteria.

3. If membership criteria are graded, current ARL members may become and have become deficient in some areas. The Task Force should determine whether the present guidelines for maintaining ARL membership are adequate.

4. Qualitative assessments of the level of research supported by a library's collections and services may be necessary in determining membership for both academic and nonacademic libraries. The Task Force should recommend, if, when, and how such assessments should be done.

The Task Force met in July in Washington for a day. What I am presenting to you now is an interim report on our progress to date. We have not completed all of our work, but, as Lee will tell you, we think we have come far enough to report to you about what we are doing.

Now, we are well aware of the problem that has been addressed in the charge. The present criteria are 50% of the required medians. Assuming — as everybody knows — that we are generally not adding libraries who are way up in the criteria statistical (because they would be in ARL already), what we have primarily been doing in the last years is adding libraries to the lower quartile, since 25% of the median is the lower quartile. Most of the libraries that have recently joined ARL have been in that lower quartile. The net effect, of course, is to lower the medians and basically degrade the average statistics. Inevitably, as more members are added in the lower quartile, the whole thing slides down. What we have really been doing is lowering the entering qualifications relative to the rest of the membership.

We looked at the possibilities suggested in the charge that we use a subset of members or members at a particular time, or perhaps raise the percentage, but none of these solutions really appealed to us, on the grounds that sooner or later we end up back where we started. What we turned to instead was what we think is an entirely new approach. I am going to have to get into some statistics, but since I am not a statistician, I will keep it as simple as I can.

The Statistics Task Force has been working on what is called factor analysis and regression analysis. Let me explain it as follows.

This method of analysis takes a group of factors — in this case criteria measurable in ARL libraries — and it looks at each criterion, e.g. volumes added, or volumes held. For each criterion it establishes a distribution, a curve, of all ARL libraries. The more alike ARL libraries are for any particular criterion, i.e., the more similar their data are, the more the curve is in the middle and the less of a tail there is. For some criteria, ARL libraries are more alike than for other criteria, with libraries tending to bunch in the middle of the bell-shaped curve. Where the libraries are not alike, the curve tends to flatten out and has very long tails on both sides.

The theory of using this methodology is that if we want to keep the Association, in terms of membership, looking like it is, we should look for members whose libraries look as much as possible like the libraries already in ARL statistically as well as qualitatively. In compiling the index, we have decided on ten criteria, basically the same ones we have been using for the present admissions criteria, with some changes. I will go down the list and tell you whether they are the same or not.

1. Volumes held is the same.

2. Volumes added, gross, is the same.

3. Current serials is the same.

4. We are recommending using the number of microforms held in ARL libraries, which is not a present criterion.

5-6. Professional staff and nonprofessional staff is presently a lumped criterion. We will split it into two separate categories, as we think that there is enough variance between the two.

7-8. Materials expenditures is the same, except that we would split out binding expenditures as a separate category in the new system, because there is a different spread. That is, expenditures for materials and expenditures for binding do not have the same distribution among ARL libraries.

9. Total salary expenditures, same.

10. Total operating expenditures, same.

One factor that is in the present list is not in this suggested list: Ph.D. fields. We will propose that ARL establish a number of Ph.D. fields as one of the qualitative criteria and we will preface a document on membership with these qualitative criteria, addressing such things as the research mission of the institution, the fact that it must be a doctoral degree-granting institution and that degrees must be granted in a certain number of fields; we have not established exactly what those numbers ought to be. However, rather than data that we manipulate, they will be basically the doormat criteria; you do not get across the doorstep until you at least meet those criteria.

We are going to recommend a parameter of one standard deviation. Now, do not ask me for a definition, because we do not have that much time. A parameter of one standard deviation will mean that 80-90% of the libraries in ARL will fit in a range and to get into ARL under this system, a library must look like 80-90% of the ARL libraries. Not the average, not the median, but "like" them; it must fit in somewhere in that distribution. We would normally expect libraries to fit in toward the bottom of the distribution, but the bottom of the distribution is not the lowest library already in ARL. It is the library that is within one standard deviation. In the recent figures there are about 11 or 12 libraries below one standard deviation, and I will get to what happens in this case in a minute.

In other words, a new library is not going to look exactly like the lowest group of libraries, but like a group of libraries in the middle. We would propose using this method for determining whether or not an academic library is eligible for membership in ARL.

We would use the same methodology for maintenance of membership, except that we would establish the standard deviation of 1.75; that is, that the library must stay above -1.75 to stay in ARL. The difference between this and the present systems is a major one. Under the present system of maintenance of membership,

(which I must say has not been applied to any libraries, as far as I know) if an ARL library falls beneath the entry level qualifications in any one category for more than four years, it theoretically should be out of the Association. (We have not applied these criteria, I guess, because the task force that recommended them made the report less than four years ago.) What we are recommending is that, rather than using this same-as-the-entry level, we would use the index score of -1.75. The net effect is that falling behind in one category, such as number of Ph.D. fields — I want to use that as an example — or number of volumes added, may not affect maintenance of membership standards. However, if you fall behind in the large, i. e., in the total ten factors put together, then you are basically below the maintenance of membership. To get back into the category that is above that -1.75 line, you do not have to do any one particular thing. Almost anything you do to improve the quality of your library affects your total score and raises you.

If we were to apply the present criteria absolutely, there is nothing that a library that is deficient in the number of Ph.D. fields can do. I cannot conceive of a university adding seven Ph.D. fields because ARL is going to throw its library out. Or even one field, the way the situation is today. But as our present criteria are written, that is exactly what would happen.

Another example: the size of the staff. If the size of the professional staff falls below a certain number, maybe that is a sign of efficiency rather than deficiency. Why should a library be penalized, assuming, of course, its total stand puts it above that -1.75?

We think this methodology is a great improvement in many ways. And, as I said, we presented it to the Board yesterday in greater detail, and we were generally pleased by their reaction.

As I mentioned earlier, this is an interim report. We have really one other major task: to refine this whole process so that it can become meaningful to anybody without a Ph.D. in statistics. Also, we have been asked by the Board to find some better method for defining the criteria under which nonacademic research libraries can be admitted to membership. There are no real criteria, and current practice is essentially that the buck is passed by the Board to an ad hoc committee, which does not have any criteria, either.

So the Task Force on ARL Membership has agreed to come up with a set of qualitative criteria that should be applied to nonacademic research libraries that we would like to consider for membership. Our present feeling is that we will do that, not just by saying "How many books?" or, "What kind of books?", but by relating the mission of these libraries to the mission of ARL. Thus one of the first things we are going to do is to define what we think is the mission of ARL's membership and then to define what additional members have to look like in terms of mission and goals to be invited into ARL.

I think, Lee, I will stop here. I am willing to answer anything that is not highly mathematical. First, let me say two things. Richard Talbot and Kendon Stubbs have been of great assistance to us in this process, as has been Carol Mandel, who has been handling a lot of the paperwork. Richard is my expert on statistics, if you have any questions. We plan to complete our work this winter and to make a final report to the Board in May.

MR. ANDERSON: Are there any questions?

MR. BLACKBURN (Toronto): May I comment? I am very interested to hear what Jay has to say about membership criteria, and the need to and means of limiting membership. I have been talking lately, as recently as last evening, to somebody from the American Association of Universities, where they have purposely restricted their membership to quite a low number; I think it is 50. One of the people [from the University of Toronto Press] is on the Executive Committee of the Association of American University Presses. At this moment they are beginning to worry about what to do about presses that really are not publishing much any more, and they are wondering how they can apply retrospective birth control to their membership.

As the membership book went round this morning, I had a look at the page for January 1948. I had two or three reasons for looking at that page. I was curious to see how many people here had also signed the page at that meeting, and there are two: Stephen McCarthy, who was then recently appointed Director at Cornell, and myself. We are the survivors.

There were two rather important things, precedents, perhaps, set at that meeting. One was that this was the launching of the Farmington Plan, about which some of you may have heard. It showed what an association of, then, I think, 43 members, could do in terms of national and even international significance.

The other precedent, which may be of interest to Jay and his committee, I am sure none of you have ever heard about. Charles David, who was chairing the meeting (he was President in those days) took me aside and said that the Executive — now, he didn't explain who "the Executive" was; I rather thought it meant Charles David, from Pennsylvania — had decided that Toronto really had not been keeping up to scratch so far as its research collection was concerned. There was another Midwestern university that wanted in and, since ARL really felt that they should not increase their total membership, they had decided that Toronto would be dropped from the list. We were dropped for several years, until we were able to recover our standing somewhat and until ARL began enlarging its membership. Now, I think ARL missed a real chance there, because they had eliminated their one foreign member. This afternoon you have just voted your tenth or eleventh Canadian member into the Association.

Of course, there have been a great many other members who have joined as well, but it seems to me that the number of members is really essential, and that it relates to the mission of the Association (maybe the mission has changed from the days when 40 institutions was the idea number). When Page Ackerman's committee was working on criteria the last time, I wrote her a long letter advocating that somehow the membership should be trimmed to the big 50. I thought it might have more punch in that way. But perhaps the present membership is the ideal number, considering the mainly political mission that ARL now has.

I am very pleased to hear what Jay had to report, and I thought perhaps he and the membership should know that there is a precedent for ARL trimming its membership.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you very much. Any other comments? Questions? As you heard Jay say, we expect that the Task Force will have completed its work

by the May meeting and the membership will then, of course, have an opportunity to discuss, review, and make some disposition of their recommendations.

Jay also referred to the discussions at the Board of Director's meeting yesterday. Because the Board was so impressed with the work of the task force so far, they endorsed the direction in which the task force was moving and also offered a recommendation which we want to present to you at this moment, to wit: That the ARL membership call a moratorium on accepting new applications for ARL membership until after the May 1980 ARL meeting.

A MEMBER: So move.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: The motion has been made and seconded. Do you wish to discuss this motion? All in favor of the motion indicate by saying "aye." Contrary, "nay." (The motion passed.) A moratorium is now in effect.

Report of the Executive Director Search Committee

MR. ANDERSON: We wear several hats when we are on the Board of Directors. When Mr. Lorenz announced his retirement, of course that suggested a successor. A successor suggested a Search Committee. The Search Committee suggested a chair, and the chair is the Vice President of ARL, Connie Dunlap. She would like to present a report at this time.

MS. DUNLAP: I am assisted in the Search Committee efforts by two members of the Board, Irene Hoadley and Jay Lucker, and by Binford Conley from Howard.

We, as I think all of you know, sent out a flyer describing the job. Let me point out that the flyer was not intended to be a job description, but merely some information about the job itself. We sent a cover letter to each one of you, as well as to a number of other people in allied fields, e.g. a number of the association and foundation presidents or executive directors, and so on. We also placed an ad in The Chronicle of Higher Education that appeared in the October 1 issue. So far we have had really quite good response, resulting in some 19 or 20 nominations. That does not mean applications, of course, just nominations. We are in the process now of inviting those people who have been recommended to apply.

The deadline for application is November 15. After that time, the committee will convene, probably by conference call, and discuss the applications received, and winnow them down to maybe two or three of the top candidates. The candidates will be invited to be interviewed at the February ARL Board meeting.

Report on the Office of Management Studies

MR. WEBSTER (Office of Management Studies): As a way of streamlining this report, I have put together a brief status report on what we have been doing in the Office since the last membership meeting, available as a handout at the front

door. If you have questions about some of the program activities, I would urge you to address those questions to any of the Office staff. They are here, and I encourage you to talk with them.

I want to highlight one item in that status report: the Consultant Training Program that we have been working on since the last meeting. As you may recall, we announced the program in the spring and asked you to nominate outstanding people from your staff and to encourage those people to apply to the program. The response was overwhelming: we received over 250 applications though we were equipped to provide only 20 training opportunities to in the first year. We were very pleased with the caliber of the candidates, and expect that over the next five years we will be able to engage additional numbers of those people who applied in this first year. I hope you will keep in mind that this program is a continuing one which will be available to your staffs in the future.

There is a press release on the front table listing the 20 people who were invited to participate in the first year of the consultant training. The training begins this Sunday, with a two-week workshop. After that, each of the individuals will work with an Office staff member in the conduct of an actual study and evaluation.

I would also like to comment very briefly on the grant made by the National Endowment for the Humanities to the Association in support of the OMS proposal to design, test, and operate a self-study procedure to enable individual research libraries to assess the dimension of the preservation problem that exists in their own institutions. The studies will result in plans and decisions that will reduce such problems for the libraries in the future. The grant is roughly $152,000. One of our first tasks on the project is to recruit a preservation specialist to coordinate the program. We are also creating an advisory committee to assist with the project. If any of you have suggestions for people for this committee or for the position of project coordinator, I would be very interested in having those recommendations. The press release describing the grant also is available as a handout at the front.

A third item I would like to touch on briefly relates to the assessment and project planning inquiry that ARL Directors responded to this summer. As you may recall, it has been about five years since the OMS went to the membership with a formal inquiry asking your views on the usefulness and importance of the OMS programs to your operations. We put this survey together in conjunction with the OMS Advisory Committee and the Committee will be working with us in preparing a report of the results. One of the highlights of the responses concerned your interest in working with the preservation issue. This topic received the most expressions of interest in the survey. This, of course, nicely matches NEH's decision to provide the Office with funds to design a tool that would allow you to act on that interest.

In addition to these topics, Lee Anderson asked me to comment briefly on the financial and advisory relationships that exist between the ARL and the OMS. I believe Lee received a question from somebody in the membership concerning the dimension of the stake ARL has in the OMS, and how the OMS reaches decisions on priorities and makes judgments on how its programs are going to be operated.

Basically, we operate with an expenditure rate of around $400,000 in this current year, of which the ARL portion is $50,000; the rest is secured from either cost recovery or foundation support. The budget for the Office is a programmatic budget. A central program for the Office is the Academic Library Program, which has received a five-year grant. This is the program that includes the consultant skills training and the self-study programs. The funding comes from three sources: the Andrew Mellon Foundation, the Council on Library Resources, and a direct subsidy from ARL which amounts to $50,000 each year.

Other programs operated by the Office include the information clearinghouse (the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center) and the Training Program. These activities are supported in part by funds generated through sale of publications and services. Roughly $100,000 a year is recovered in costs through the sale of these services and publications.

Beyond the program funding and cost recovery support, we have a series of grants that allow us to do specific projects, such as the NEH grant. In addition, the Lilly Endowment has commissioned us to do a planning program for smaller academic libraries. We have had several grants from the H.W. Wilson Foundation to support short-term, rather modest projects, including the resource notebooks that you have recently received and the distribution of SPEC materials to library schools.

In terms of advisory relationships, we operate three advisory committees that work very closely with us. The central one is the OMS Advisory Committee, which was established by the ARL Board to monitor OMS activities, to assist us in project planning, and, as we are preparing to do in December for the coming year, to outline priorities for the office. This group also reviews our performance in relation to the previous year's set of priorities. The OMS Advisory Committee members are: Millicent Abell, Louis Martin, Frank Grisham, Irene Hoadley, William Studer, and Page Ackerman.

Another committee that is very important at this time is the Academic Library Program Advisory Committee. This group assisted in the design of the selection procedure for the consultants, and worked with us in screening the applicants, conducting the interviews, and making the decisions on those applicants. There are three ARL Directors on that Committee: Jay Lucker, James Wyatt, and Charles Churchwell. We also have an Advisory Committee working with us on the Lilly Endowment grant for the small library project.

I am most willing to respond to any further questions on where the money comes from, how much money is involved, where the decisions are being made, and what the relationship of the Office is to ARL.

I will close by giving my own special thanks to John Lorenz for the support, encouragement, and warm interest that he has demonstrated in the Office during his three years here.

MR. LORENZ: Thank you, Duane.

Report of the Task Force on National Library Network Development

MR. ANDERSON: The Task Force on National Library Network Development has developed a position paper which was presented to the Board of Directors yesterday. The task force then met after the Board meeting and has since submitted a draft of their report. The chair of the task force, Richard Dougherty, is ready to present that report.

MR. DOUGHERTY (Michigan): Before beginning, I would like to bring the Association up to date on developments with the Network Advisory Committee (NAC). The Committee has had difficulty for several months in deciding what its role should be. At a meeting about a month ago, at the recommendation of the Council on Library Resources and the Library of Congress, the group decided to try to operate as a forum and to explore issues related to networking that are of concern to the members of NAC.

NAC has now grown to over 30 members and almost every organization, ranging from the Information Industry Association to the American Library Association and ARL, is represented. And that, as I think I have reported to you before, in many respects is at the heart of their dilemma: because of the different stakeholders, there are very few issues upon which that group can agree.

After some discussion, the one, very complicated issue that everyone agreed should be discussed is the control and ownership of information, of which bibliographic data is a subset. We will try to present a program on this issue at the next forum. We are now in the process of soliciting suggestions from individual members as to what specific topics should be addressed at this meeting. It is too soon to tell just how we will proceed, but it was agreed at the last NAC meeting that this first presentation would be only for NAC itself. My own feeling is that if this meeting is successful and the members walk away feeling that they have learned something, provisions will be made to make this information generally available, because of the current interest in the question of ownership, control, and distribution of information. If there are any questions about NAC, I would be happy to respond.

Turning attention to the report of our task force, let me first acknowledge the members of the task force, because they deserve a great deal of credit. They are: Hugh Atkinson, Patricia Battin, Russell Shank, William Studer, and William Welsh.

It is a difficult topic, and we have worked several months on trying to unravel some of the issues of which I think everyone is aware. For those of you who attended the Cambridge meeting I do not have to review the issues. We had the four directors of the utilities there, they described their programs, and a number of questions were asked.

A number of individual members have asked the task force members what they should do in choices regarding utilities. I believe that it is safe to say that the task force agrees that it would be inappropriate, or even inadvisable, for ARL to take a position one way or the other. What we have tried to do is synthesize some of the issues that have been raised, the issues that individual ARL library directors will have to take into account in deciding what course of action to take for their particular libraries.

The purpose of this document, in my opinion, is simply to raise some issues that we can discuss at future meetings, and to state what the task force believes are some of the services and capabilities that we are interested in seeing the bibliographic utilities offer in the future. The document simply provides some background information and I think it is safe to say that the heart of the document begins on page 5, although on the bottom of page 4 there are also some other considerations that we think are important.

We are asking the membership to approve the document so that it can be released and so that we can begin to disseminate information as to what the position of the Association is on the question of requirements of the National Bibliographic Network designed to serve the needs of research libraries.

MR. ANDERSON: You have heard that the Task Force recommends to the membership that it adopt the recommendations delineated in that report. A motion is in order.

A MEMBER: I so move.

MR. ANDERSON: A motion has been made. Is there a second?

A MEMBER: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: Let us discuss the motion.

MR. CHURCHWELL (Washington University): As Dick has indicated there are some very important issues raised in this document, and I thought I heard him say that one of the purposes of raising them at this time is for us to get a chance to discuss them in detail. As I have hastily gone through the document, it seems to me that there are some very complex issues which require additional debate before we can approve the five recommendations.

We are being asked to approve this document as an official policy position, and I personally am not in a position to give that kind of approval until I get some additional information. For example, I am not sure I understand what is meant by "peer institutions" when it comes to bibliographic data. I am not sure I understand what is meant in this document when we say that OCLC was designed to serve all types of libraries. I am speaking now to "all types libraries." In the next sentence we indicate that it is not designed to serve the perceived needs of special types of libraries. I think it is those kinds of complexities on which we need additional information. If OCLC isn't able to serve our needs, then why don't we address those specific problems? Thirdly, I thought the format that we get from the Library of Congress in terms of high-quality bibliographic data was the high quality that we all are seeking. And I thought we were getting that.

In summary, I do not think I have enough information to adopt these points as the official position of this organization, and I would urge that we postpone action until we have more information and a greater opportunity to discuss it.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I think the task force, Charles, was deliberately vague on some of the points you raise. For example, we did not attempt to define quality, because as you talk about the topic, quality is in the eye of the library, if you will.

The same with peer institutions. I think every library has its own group of institutions that it considers peer.

The intent was to try to provide or to suggest that, whatever is developed over the next few years, libraries should have the flexibility to work with peer institutions, as well as other libraries of different types, without trying to be specific.

The question about more information and more discussion is a legitimate one, and I do not think the task force would be adverse to that. What we would like to do is get some of these issues out and discussed. We also are making a statement suggesting that it is not ARL's role to either endorse one system or another but to think in terms of functions that we believe any utility that comes along in the next decade should provide to research libraries. Some members might need services A, B, and C; others might want D, E, and F. So we are seeking as much flexibility as possible.

MR. ATKINSON (Illinois): As a task force member, if we wish to withdraw that request for approval now, I would be perfectly willing to wait until spring to have further discussions, rather than insisting on having a motion to adopt it now.

MR. ANDERSON: We have a motion on the floor.

MR. ROSENTHAL (University of California, Berkeley): I speak in favor of trying to take some action. I think the statement articulates very well many of the concerns that have come to us and presents a good many considerations that library directors need to look at in approaching utilities. I would see its adoption by the Association at an early stage as very helpful in building a National Bibliographic Network.

MR. SCHMIDT (Brown): I gather that what we have on the floor mechanically is a motion to adopt the recommendations of the task force. Is that correct?

MR. ANDERSON: That is correct.

MR. SCHMIDT: I have spent some time since changing institutions testing in an operational way some of the assumptions that are implicit in recommendations 1 and 2, and if I am faced with a package motion that says adopt these five recommendations, I am going to have to vote no, because I do not believe that numbers 1 and 2 square with our operational agreement. So, I am stuck with either voting no, moving to delete those two recommendations from the motion, or siding with my colleague and predecessor, Mr. Churchwell, in moving to postpone to an indefinite time. I think I will choose to do the latter. I move to postpone to an indefinite time.

A MEMBER: I second the motion.

MR. ANDERSON: All right. I assume a motion to postpone takes precedence.

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: The motion is to postpone to an indefinite time. Do you wish to discuss it? The issue is whether or not to postpone.

MR. JACKSON: I would like to move to amend the motion to postpone consideration of the recommendations until the next meeting of this Association. I have felt that the time we have had to look at the report has been a little unseemly, and there are implications in it that require greater consideration.

A MEMBER: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: The motion to postpone has been amended to read "at the next meeting." So, under discussion now is the amendment to postpone not indefinitely, but to the May meeting. Speak to the amendment, please.

MR. SCHELL (Cincinnati): I would like to make a further amendment. I would like to amend that the Association membership be informed prior to having to take action on this important matter. Let us not just hand it out at the next meeting.

MR. ANDERSON: I do not think that is germane to the motion. If you want to raise that idea as procedure after we have disposed of the motion, we will consider it.

MR. SCHELL: I will do that.

MR. ANDERSON: Let us get back to the amendment. Do you wish to debate the amendment further? All in favor of the motion to amend signify by saying "aye." Contrary, "nay." It is carried. Now we have an amended motion under discussion, to consider the report at the May meeting in Salt Lake City.

MS. MARTIN (Johns Hopkins): I have a major question. In reading this and considering the environment that we are in — a very rapidly changing environment, both organizationally, politically, and economically — my immediate reaction would be to vote positively. But my question is: if we do postpone, what is the appropriate action to take between now and the May meeting? I do not think it is appropriate to just sit around and wait for May.

MR. ANDERSON: I hope you are not addressing the Chair with that question.

MS. MARTIN: I am addressing the people who are in favor of postponing.

MR. ANDERSON: Jim Schmidt, would you like to respond?

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, I will try, but I will speak only for myself and not for anyone else. It seems to me that there have been a number of comments that have struck the same theme, that theme being that in these five recommendations are embodied some positions of considerable political and philosophical importance to the Association, and embedded in the five recommendations are, as well, some implied premises, assumptions, conclusions about the way data are maintained. So, therefore, it comes to my mind that in the ensuing months, one of the things that the task force could appropriately do is to be diligent in seeking out reactions from our colleagues assembled and others who have departed, about the recommendations, about the premises that are implicit in the recommendations, and about some of the consequences of those positions.

MR. ANDERSON: Does the task force wish to respond in any way to the advice that has been offered to them? And would that satisfy or at least answer some of the questions?

MR. DOUGHERTY: I think we have found the new chair of the task force. I think it is appropriate to discuss those issues, and I do not disagree with what Jim is saying about the intent. Maybe the best way to inform or to educate the membership on these issues is to have a meeting scheduled in the near future. I doubt, however, Jim, if we could deal with this particular issue in a way that would be acceptable to all concerned. I suspect we would find ourselves back in the same sort of box. I do believe, though, that the issues ought to be explored and I think there are a lot of people in the Association who really do want to discuss them. So the postponement to May is quite reasonable.

MR. DE GENNARO (Pennsylvania): I have no objection to postponing it until May but I do think that it is important for this Association to begin to address these issues soon, because, as Sue Martin just indicated, this is a fast-moving field and we are supposed to be the Association of Research Libraries. If we do not express a view as to what we want the networks to do to accommodate our needs and so on, it is going to happen anyway, and it may happen before May. The whole thing will be solidified and positions will be taken and whenever we do decide what we want to do, in May or next year, it may well be too late.

MR. ANDERSON: Any further comments on the motion? All in favor of the motion to postpone consideration of the report which was presented by the task force until the May 1980 meeting at Salt Lake City indicate by saying "aye." Contrary, "nay." Let us have a show of hands. All in favor of the motion raise your right hand, please. All opposed, same sign. The motion carries. Discussion of the paper is postponed until the May meeting.

Report on China Trip

MR. ANDERSON: A number of months ago, the National Library of Peking invited a delegation from American libraries to visit China. The Library of Congress, which received the invitation and formed the delegation, invited this Association to designate three members. As the delegation membership evolved, we found that ARL had some other members as well, including the head of the delegation, the Deputy Librarian of Congress, William Welsh.

It was my good fortune to be part of that delegation as this year's President of ARL. Bill Welsh has agreed to present some impressions and God only knows what else about this trip.

MR. WELSH: I characterize the entire experience as the Incredible Journey. As Lee said, this trip was the result of many years of negotiation, and after the invitation was received, it turned out to be an "official invitation." This meant a number of things, including the fact that the Chinese government paid our expenses once we were in China.

There were three members from ARL, three from the American Library Association, three from the Association for Asian Studies, and three from LC. And

it was most fortunate that we had three from Asian Studies because they were a vital link in the communication channel. It was a distinguished group and received splendid cooperation. I had the honor and the privilege, and what turned out to be the responsibility, of heading the delegation. Warren Tsuneishi served as secretary, and I have recommended Warren for the first Library of Congress Purple Shaft Award for his work.

There were some benefits for serving as head of the delegation. I had a suite and a shower. I also had an enormous responsibility to determine when official receptions ended. It became quite clear immediately, even though I was aware of it, that this was a very onerous task, since the courses that were served at any particular meal did not follow any particular practice. There could be seven or twelve courses.

There was one incident that perhaps I have not even shared even with members of the delegation. Ambassador Leonard Woodcock was among those who offered a reception in honor of this occasion. He was tired all of this activity, so we had a chance to talk about Hill matters. But I did consult with him as to how he handled the matter of ending a reception. He said that he had solved that problem just shortly after he arrived. If it is to be an hour reception, three-quarters into the hour he serves cupcakes, which is a signal that 15 minutes later the reception will end. It was 20 minutes of the hour. At a quarter of exactly, the cupcakes came out, and he said, "Now, watch 15 minutes later." Exactly 15 minutes later, the head of the National Library of Peking, who was the senior person there from the Chinese side, got up and Woodcock grabbed me by the arm and we walked out the door. A few minutes later his wife followed us and said, "You have committed a terrible goof." "Why?" he asked. And she replied that the head of the delegation was only looking for another cupcake.

Our group met in Tokyo, and we flew to Peking, Sian, and Shanghai. We took the train to and from Nanking, and then we flew from Shanghai to Canton and took the train to Hong Kong. All of the people who are in this room played a very, very important role. I do want to single out, however, the particular role that ARL played. This was not all on the good side — there was some insubordination. Some of them, for example, refused to join us in Tokyo. And then there was some idiosyncratic behavior on the part of one member of ARL. Every time we got near an airport, he would disappear. I did not find out until some time during the course of the trip that he was looking for a lost bag.

I want to begin with a disclaimer. I have been asked a number of times, what was China like? I think it is going to take me several years before I am able to answer that in any dispassionate way. And I will explain now quickly why.

First of all, the hospitality accorded to us by the Chinese was beyond anything I had ever experienced, and I have traveled widely. We were met at every city by a delegation and that same delegation saw to our departure. They gave a number of receptions. The general arrangements were taken care of and they were willing to accommodate all of our needs. We had a few problems with accommodations because of the great number of tourists that are presently in China. But it is my very sincere feeling that they did everything humanly possible to make our stay as comfortable as possible. The National Library assigned two people to accompany us on the entire trip. One, an interpreter, and the other to handle the general details of arranging for things at the next stop.

Some general observations: It was very, very distressing to learn and to see firsthand the impact of the Cultural Revolution, which had an effect for a four-to-ten-year period. The resulting gap in education I can only characterize as a national disaster. I do not think it possible for the country of China to recover any time soon from this. At every level one saw the senior staff and then there was very clearly a gap. Very rarely were there any young people in attendance.

They are, in my judgment, 40 to 50 years behind us in almost every respect. The industry of the people at all levels was quite overwhelming — everybody seemed to be doing something. A great deal of rebuilding is being done, though one is not sure whether this is according to some master plan or not. It could be WPA, it could be moving bricks about. The women are sweeping the streets. One woman sweeps it this way and another woman sweeps it back. But there is, overall, a feeling of great, intense effort. Whether they are all highly motivated or not, I am unable to judge.

In the rural areas, the impact of the Cultural Revolution is quite in evidence. The number of people that were taken out of schools to work in the communues has resulted in very impressive agricultural achievements. Not at any level that we would understand, unless some of you are considerably older than I expect. But scarcely a weed could be found in any of the plots. And again one does not know whether it is a matter of orchestration or whether it is survival-based. There obviously is an enormous problem of feeding that population, and they are busily engaged in doing so.

One is made aware almost constantly that almost everything is state owned. For example, there are no private automobiles and there are not that many automobiles at all, but there are millions of bicycles and there are thousands and thousands of two-wheel carts and some tractors the likes of which you can find now in this country only when you visit a country fair.

It is estimated that in 20 years there will be 900 million people living in the rural areas, and that is with their approach to population control. It is staggering to see the number of people there. Modernization, I think, if it is unstructured, could produce economic collapse. I do not know how they are going to modernize their farms. There are very, very few tractors, as we understand them, in evidence. Most of the agricultural work is done on an individual basis, with, as I say, a great deal of effort. Living conditions range from very poor to good.

Sanitation and irrigation. When you rise above the land in a plane, for example coming from Sian to Shanghai, and see the irrigation, you wonder whether this is water, ground water as a result of the semitropical conditions, or whether there is some master plan. It is really the incredible network of water that is, of course, required to grow rice and other crops. There is little evidence of sanitation in the homes; especially on our train trips we saw a number of ponds. Almost every small house would have a pond with it. No evidence, however, of running water in the sense that we understand it.

About libraries. It became clear almost from the beginning that we really were there as consultants. They had concerns about automation, preservation, training, standardization, and collections and exchanges. We very quickly reached agreement with the National Library of Peking on an exchange between

the Library of Congress and that library, and I am certain that other exchanges will come about.

One result from our trip has already taken place. The Institute for Scientific and Technical Information has written to us to ask the Library of Congress to arrange for a three-week trip for six engineers and architects to visit our country. My first reaction was that I ought to put this in the proper channels, for example through the National Science Foundation, but realizing that the request was a result of our trip, I decided that we would take on that responsibility.

Our conclusion, as we completed the tour, was that they should go very, very slowly on automation. There is little evidence of computers. The Wang Company did provide four mini-computers to one institution and, as a matter of fact, they had a program that was up and working. But they have done little in the way of standardization except for the standard classification which they developed a number of years ago. It was in evidence in most of the libraries that we visited. They have, I think without exception, classified catalogs.

But even though the cataloging information is supplied by the National Library and even though the head of cataloging at another library would say that they were using the cataloging provided by the National Library, if you asked the cataloger doing the cataloging, she would say no, they really were not using it, as it was not done on a timely basis. I have heard that story some place before.

I am in the process of drafting a letter to the National Librarian. Even though we were not asked to do this, I thought it would be useful to give him the benefit of our experience. They must proceed very slowly. They should come to this country when they have the people to send, to learn something from some of our mistakes — I think some of us have the courage to tell them their mistakes. They should not simply buy a package off the shelf, whoever the purveyor might be.

In the area of preservation, they seem to have done almost nothing. As a matter of fact, they seem to be operating under the worst conditions imaginable. The windows in the libraries are, without exception, open. The pollutants in the air are penetrating the libraries. They have fluorescent lighting. They seem not to recognize the problem of preservation. And we have a stake in this as well.

In the area of collections, there were a couple of places that had quite significant collections of Western language literature in science and technology. There was little evidence of any interest in collecting materials in the social sciences and the humanities. Everything seemed to be geared toward the science and technology area. Obviously they are very dependent upon their close relations with Japan and now with the U.S.; they have materials in French and Russian as well.

We spoke about the problem of training quite frankly. We advocated that they step up their program of on-the-job training, because they do not have the institutions or the teachers to train the people, should they become available. They have rules that prevent one from going to school after age 35, which is going to present a handicap, as well.

Some of us feel that they ought to be concentrating in the area of standardization: get the cataloging product produced by the National Library

in use, whenever possible, and take all the steps that we think we have taken in this country prior to automation. Whether they will abide by this or not, I do not know.

Some of the highlights. I mentioned the reception by Ambassador Woodcock, which was very pleasant. A surprise occurrence was Vice Premier Fong Yi's invitation to talk with him. We were given a 56-minute interview with him, which was then carried by radio and television and in the press. He had been very well briefed on our visit and I think it was a very good exchange.

One of the problems, maybe the major problem, that we faced was time. Part of this was our own doing. The pace was very, very rapid, and it did begin to tell as we reached Canton, certainly as we fell apart in Hong Kong. They scheduled us from morning to night and never left a moment of freedom except for two of our group who wanted to see the Great Wall and some minor things like the Ming Tombs. But, seriously, they took care of almost all of our needs and showed us everything, I think, that we wanted to see.

They took us to the opening of the National Games, which was one of the most impressive sights of our entire trip. Some of our friends here from the West Coast do a little thing with cards during half-time shows at football games. Well, they do a big thing with cards over there. They had 6,000 people moving cards about. It was absolutely incredible, one of the most beautiful scenes you can imagine, with just the flip of a card.

There was a great deal of toasting. At lunch and at dinner we were served beer, which is very good, and we were served wine, which varied considerably, and then a concoction called Mao Tai. And, as was said last night, that, coupled with the word Gambi, ought to spell disaster. But it is true, it did not produce a hangover, I am told. Often.

I regret that there was not an opportunity for in-depth discussion with any Chinese, though I tried on several occasions with the interpreter. I wanted to discuss some aspects of religion and get some of her views about the communes. But it did not proceed very far. I never got to see any private living conditions; I simply did not want to ask to see something like that. But I would have liked to see how the people live, because one was overwhelmed with the numbers and one was concerned that they did not have adequate facilities.

John, Lee, Joe, Russ, and P.K., I think it was a great group. As I said, the pace was great and the pressure was there. It could have been spoiled by somebody acting out of character, but I think we got along splendidly, and I think, as I say, it was one of the most exhilarating experiences of my life. Thank you.

Report of the President

MR. ANDERSON: Since my last report to you at Cambridge in May, many of you were good enough to forward various comments and suggestions regarding your concerns. In several instances those recommendations were referred to committees or ARL staff; in some cases they were handled personally. Without exception, all remarks were or are being considered and I assure you nothing has been ignored. I want to thank you very much for your response.

A great deal of time has been expended over the past few weeks in the area of personnel management. With the announcement of our Executive Director's retirement, the processes of locating his replacement was initiated, including the appointment of a search committee, preparation of the committee's charge and reviewing job descriptions of the office. In addition, the search for an Interim Executive Director was conducted, culminating in the selection of Ralph McCoy.

During this period or roughly coincidental to it, we had the departure of Sue Frankie and the arrival of Carol Mandel. Jim Beattie left and Nicola Daval is now on board as Information Officer.

To varying degrees, these developments demanded more time of the President than one might ordinarily expect during a typical term. As a result, perhaps less work was expended in a more visible leadership role than some might have hoped for. On the other hand, I have never been certain over the past year just what the membership expected from the President, except the precise duties delineated in the Constitution and Bylaws.

Whatever one anticipates at the beginning of a term, during the incumbency it is somehow not what one thought. It has been a challenging assignment and I do not begrudge one minute of the time and effort I put into the enterprise. I had the particularly good fortune of being President at the time the delegation was formed to go on that fabulous trip to China and I am grateful for having had that opportunity.

I believe firmly in the mission and goals of ARL, albeit their details being sometimes somewhat inexact. For whatever contributions I may have made as President, nothing could have been accomplished without the capable aid and assistance of scores of persons. To the office staff, and especially our retiring Executive Director John Lorenz, I am grateful. To the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors, and to you, the members, I am most appreciative.

I want to offer my special final thanks to two retiring members of the Board, Rudy Rogers and Past President Ray Frantz, my dear old fellow Illini. And finally to our Vice President, Connie Dunlap, who was always ready to offer the sage and sound advice for which she has acquired national renown.

So now I reach the most pleasant task which befalls an association president, and that is turning over the office to one's successor. Although it is rarely wielded, no doubt because the membership always exhibits such impeccable deportment, we do have a President's gavel. Its use seems to be more symbolic than functional, with the grand exception of this one occasion when it is transferred. So here it is, dear lady, and best wishes.

MS. DUNLAP: Thank you, Lee.

Mindful of the hour, your discomfort, and your desire to be on your way, I will not burden you with any kind of long inaugural address except to say that the success of any association is due almost entirely to its members. It is not due to the officers. All we can do is try to keep things moving a little bit. It is really you people who will measure our success. So all of us will look to you for your help, for your support, for keeping us on the track to be sure that we are aware of the kinds of things that you wish the Association to address. You are responsible.

Let me make one announcement that possibly might be of use to some of you. If any of you have collections of Civil War regimental histories or personal narratives, when you go back, see if you still have them. We do not. Nor does the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. We assume this is some sort of professional job; at Duke I only heard about it last Friday. We have not yet determined the extent of the loss, although it is quite apparent that there are several hundred volumes involved. Duke had a rather fine collection of personal narratives and the regimental histories, some of them quite valuable. We are going to take the appropriate steps of publicizing the information so that other people can be aware and so that perhaps book dealers can be aware. We have no idea when this happened, except that we feel that it has been quite recent, because there is no dust on the shelves. So be forewarned, and I wish you better luck than we had.

Is there any other business to come before the Association? If not, we are adjourned.

APPENDIX - A

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARL TASK FORCE ON BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

The Task Force has maintained liaison with the Library of Congress and become informed of LC bibliographic planning through the membership of Joseph Howard, Assistant Librarian of Congress for Processing Services. We have also maintained liaison with the ARL Task Force on National Library Network Development through the presence of Richard Dougherty, chairman of that Task Force. Mr. Dougherty has also kept the membership informed of the activities of the Network Advisory Committee of LC, the group working on the development of a national network.

The Task Force conferred with the Library of Congress through Mr. Howard on the development of the National Level of Bibliographic Records—Books, formulated by Helen Schmeier; conferred with Mr. Howard on the holding of the meeting on the standard for technical services directors at the last Midwinter Meeting of the American Library Association; and participated in the survey of reactions to the standard after that meeting. The Task Force has conferred with Mr. Howard on the implementation of the standard, approved the pilot project suggested for the implementation, and is continuing to discuss further implementation of it.

The questions of AACR 2 and the closing of catalogs has been a major topic of discussion for the Task Force throughout the year. As a result of these discussions, the Task Force recommended to the Headquarters Staff that cost models for the adoption of AACR 2 be created for member libraries, and that recommendation resulted in the engagement of King Research, Inc. to conduct the Library Catalog Cost Model Project.

The Task Force intends to continue to study these problems and to offer whatever assistance is possible to the membership in dealing with them. Among the associated problems which will receive special attention in the upcoming year are bibliographic control of microforms and the development of the necessary authority files for the national data base.

In April, the Chairman, Joseph Treyz of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, resigned because of added responsibilities assumed at his institution. James Govan of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill succeeded Mr. Treyz as Chairman, and in June, Merle Boylan of the University of Washington replaced Mr. Treyz on the Task Force.

James F. Govan
Chairman
August 1979

APPENDIX - B

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL PERIODICALS SYSTEM

Authority and Charge

The Committee was authorized by action taken by the ARL Board in the Fall of 1977. The charge to the Committee from President Frantz was:

> The ARL Committee on a National Periodicals System shall identify areas of concern to the ARL relating to the development, organization, governance, and services of such a system and recommend to the Board appropriate positions, policies, and actions for the Association. In fulfilling this responsibility, the Committee shall develop liaison with other groups whose deliberations influence developments in this area.

Membership

Richard De Gennaro - Pennsylvania
John McDonald - Connecticut
Peter Paulson - New York State Library
Allen Veaner - University of California, Santa Barbara
C. James Schmidt, Chairman - Brown

Activities

The second year of this Committee has been filled with developments leading to the drafting and introduction of legislation authorizing a National Periodicals Center. Most of these developments occurred after the Open Forum on a National Periodicals Center sponsored by NCLIS, March 19-20, 1979. Following the Open Forum, a legislative drafting team was appointed by NCLIS. At the 94th meeting, the ARL membership endorsed in principle the April 26, 1979 draft of legislation for the NPC. On September 6, 1979, H.R. 5192 was introduced in the House of Representatives. This bill amends and reauthorizes the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329) and adds a new part D to Title II, establishing a National Periodicals Center. The bill has gone through subcommittee markup and approval and was passed unanimously by the full Committee on Education and Labor. Hearings on the bill were held by the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and the Humanities on October 4, 1979. This progress has been in spite of some lessening of support for the NPC from NCLIS. Prospects for passage of NPC authorization early in the second session of the 96th Congress are excellent. ARL members will, of course, be called upon as the appropriations process unfolds.

APPENDIX - C

ATTENDANCE AT 95TH MEMBERSHIP MEETING
WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 16-17, 1979

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Bruce Peel

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Riggs

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Douglas Bush

University of British Columbia Library
Ann Turner

Brown University Library
C. James Schmidt

University of California Library, Berkeley
Joseph Rosenthal

University of California Library, Davis
Bernard Kreissman

University of California Library, Los Angeles
Russell Shank

University of California Library, Riverside
Eleanor Montague

University of California Library, San Diego
Millicent D. Abell

University of California Library, Santa Barbara
Allen B. Veaner

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon Williams

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Harold Schell

University of Colorado Library
Clyde Walton

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Patricia Battin

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
Louis E. Martin

Dartmouth College Libraries
Margaret A. Otto

Duke University Libraries
Connie Dunlap

Emory University Library
Paul Cousins

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles E. Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
David F. Bishop

University of Guelph Library
Margaret Beckman

Harvard University Library
Not represented

University of Hawaii Library
Don L. Bosseau

University of Houston Libraries
Robert V. Haynes

Howard University Libraries
Binford H. Conley

University of Illinois Library
Hugh Atkinson

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Not represented

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
Susan K. Martin

University of Kansas Library
Robert Malinowsky

University of Kentucky Libraries
Faith Harders

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
William Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry, Jr.

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
Graham R. Hill

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard Talbot

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Jay K. Lucker

University of Miami Library
Frank Rodgers

University of Michigan Library
Richard M. Dougherty

Michigan State University Library
Richard E. Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Not represented

University of Missouri Library
R. Grey Cole

National Agricultural Library
Richard A. Farley

National Library of Canada
Not represented

National Library of Medicine
James Barry

University of Nebraska Libraries
Ronald Swanson

The Newberry Library
Joel L. Samuels

University of New Mexico Library
Paul Vassallo

New York Public Library
David H. Stam

New York State Library
Peter Paulson

New York University Libraries
Carlton C. Rochell

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
George Sereiko

Ohio State University Libraries
William J. Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
Sul H. Lee

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
Donald T. Smith

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Barbara Smith

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora E. Rossell

Princeton University Library
Barbara Brown

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University Library
Margot B. McBurney

Rice University Library
Samuel Carrington

University of Rochester Libraries
Alan R. Taylor

Rutgers University Library
Hendrik Edelman

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Robert Maloy

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern Calif. Library
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinios University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
Not represented

State University of New York at Albany
John J. Farley

State University of New York at Buffalo
Not represented

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Esther Walls

Syracuse University Libraries
Metod Milac

Temple University Library
Joseph Boisse

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Harold W. Billings

Texas A & M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert Blackburn

Tulane University Library
William Newman

University of Utah Libraries
Roger K. Hanson

Vanderbilt University Library
Frank P. Grisham

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Univ.
Thomas Souter

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz

University of Washington Library
Not represented

Washington State University Library
Allene F. Schnaitter

Washington University Libraries
Charles Churchwell

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Western Ontario Library
Not represented

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph Treyz

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

York University Library
Anne Woodsworth

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.	University of California Library, San Diego
Anderson, Le Moyne W.	Colorado State University Library
Atkinson, Hugh	University of Illinois Library
Barry, James	National Library of Medicine
Battin, Patricia	Columbia University Libraries
Beckman, Margaret	University of Guelph Library
Billings, Harold W.	University of Texas Libraries
Bishop, David F.	University of Georgia Libraries
Blackburn, Robert	University of Toronto Libraries
Boisse, Joseph	Temple University Library
Bosseau, Don L.	University of Hawaii Library
Brown, Barbara	Princeton University Library
Budington, William S.	John Crerar Library
Bush, Douglas	Brigham Young University Library
Carrington, Samuel	Rice University Library
Chapin, Richard	Michigan State University Library
Churchwell, Charles	Washington University Libraries
Cole, R. Grey	University of Missouri Library
Conley, Binford H.	Howard University Libraries
Cousins, Paul	Emory University Library
Dagnese, Joseph M.	Purdue University Library
De Gennaro, Richard	University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Dougherty, Richard M.	University of Michigan Library
Dunlap, Connie	Duke University Libraries
Dunlap, Leslie W.	University of Iowa Libraries
Edelman, Hendrik	Rutgers University Library
Farley, John J.	State University of New York at Albany
Farley, Richard A.	National Agricultural Library
Frantz, Ray	University of Virginia Libraries
Gillies, Thomas D.	Linda Hall Library
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Grisham, Frank P.	Vanderbilt University Library
Guidry, George	Louisiana State University Library
Hanson, Roger K.	University of Utah Libraries
Harders, Faith	University of Kentucky Libraries
Harrar, H. Joanne	University of Maryland Library
Harrer, Gustave A.	University of Florida Libraries

Haynes, Robert V.	University of Houston Libraries
Hill, Graham R.	McMaster University Library
Hoadley, Irene	Texas A&M University Library
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Jackson, W. Carl	Indiana University Libraries
Jeffs, Joseph E.	Georgetown University Library
Jones, James V.	Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Kidman, Roy L.	University of Southern California Library
Kreissman, Bernard	University of California Library, Davis
Kritzer, Hyman W.	Kent State University Libraries
Laird, David W.	University of Arizona Library
Laucus, John	Boston University Library
Lee, Sul H.	University of Oklahoma Library
Lucker, Jay K.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries
McBurney, Margot B.	Queen's University Library
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McElderry, Stanley	University of Chicago Library
McGowan, John P.	Northwestern University Libraries
McNiff, Philip J.	Boston Public Library
Malinowsky, Robert	University of Kansas Library
Maloy, Robert	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Martin, Louis E.	Cornell University Libraries
Martin, Susan K.	Johns Hopkins University Library
Milac, Metod	Syracuse University Libraries
Miller, Charles E.	Florida State University Library
Montague, Eleanor	University of California Library, Riverside
Newman, William	Tulane University Library
Otto, Margaret A.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Paulson, Peter	New York State Library
Peel, Bruce	University of Alberta Library
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Pings, Vern M.	Wayne State University Libraries
Riggs, Donald	Arizona State University Library
Rocheli, Carlton C.	New York University Libraries
Rodgers, Frank	University of Miami Library
Rosenthal, Joseph	University of California Library, Berkeley
Rossell, Glenora E.	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Rouse, Roscoe	Oklahoma State University Library
Rogers, Rutherford D.	Yale University Library
Samuels, Joel L.	The Newberry Library
Schell, Harold	University of Cincinnati Libraries
Schmidt, C. James	Brown University Library
Schnaitter, Allene F.	Washington State University Library
Scott, Marianne	McGill University Library

Sereiko, George	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Shank, Russell	University of California Library, Los Angeles
Smith, Barbara	Pennsylvania State University Library
Smith, Donald T.	University of Oregon Library
Souter, Thomas	Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State University
Stam, David H.	New York Public Library
Studer, William J.	Ohio State University Libraries
Swanson, Ronald	University of Nebraska Libraries
Talbot, Richard	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Taylor, Alan R.	University of Rochester Libraries
Toombs, Kenneth E.	University of South Carolina Library
Treyz, Joseph	University of Wisconsin Libraries
Turner, Ann	University of British Columbia Library
Vassallo, Paul	University of New Mexico Library
Veaner, Allen B.	University of California Library, Santa Barbara
Walls, Esther	State University of New York at Stony Brook
Walton, Clyde	University of Colorado Library
Welsh, William	Library of Congress
Williams, Gordon	Center for Research Libraries
Woodsworth, Anne	York University Library
Wyatt, James F.	University of Alabama Libraries

Guests

James Banner	American Association for the Advancement of Humanities (speaker)
Richard Boss	Information Systems Consultants, Inc. (speaker)
David Breneman	Brookings Institution (speaker)
Susan Brynteson	Indiana University
Margaret Child	National Endowment for the Humanities
Rebecca Dixon	CLR Intern - Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Stephen Goodell	National Endowment for the Humanities
Nancy Gwinn	Council on Library Resources
Warren Haas	Council on Library Resources (speaker)
Dick Hays	Office of Education
Joseph Howard	Library of Congress
Carol Ishimoto	Harvard University
C. Lee Jones	Council on Library Resources
Ake Koel	Yale University
Stephen McCarthy	
Thomas Noble	American Council of Learned Societies
Susan Nutter	CLR Intern - University of North Carolina
Richard Sullivan	Carnegie Corporation of New York
Alphonse Trezza	National Commission on Libraries & Information Science
Barbara Turlington	Association of American Universities

ARL Staff

John G. Lorenz, Executive Director
Carol A. Mandel, Associate Executive Director
Nicola Daval, Information Officer
P. K. Yu, Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of Management Studies
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Associate, Office of Management Studies
P. Grady Morein, Associate, Office of Management Studies
Deanna Marcum, Training Program Specialist, Office of Management Studies
Maxine Sitts, Information Services Specialist, Office of Management Studies

APPENDIX - D

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES, AND TASK FORCES

OCTOBER 1979

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1978/1979

Le Moyne W. Anderson, President
Connie Dunlap, Vice President & President-Elect
Kay W. Frantz, Jr., Past President
Richard M. Dougherty (Oct. 1980)
Frank P. Grisham (Oct. 1980)
Irene B. Hoadley (Oct. 1981)
Jay K. Lucker (Oct. 1980)
Margot B. McBurney (Oct. 1981)
Rutherford D. Rogers (Oct. 1979)
James F. Wyatt (Oct. 1981)

STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Cagle, Lilly Library (1979)
C. Herbert Finch, Cornell (1979)
John Finzi, LC (1979)
Leslie W. Dunlap, Chairman (1979)

Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Gustave A. Harrer (1980)
Bruce Peel (1980)
Gordon R. Williams (1980)
Joseph E. Jeffs, Chairman (1980)

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1980)
Thomas D. Gillies (1979)
Ron Naylor, University of Maryland (1979)
Kenneth Peterson (1981)
Jay K. Lucker, Chairman (1980)

Committee on Membership (Ad Hoc)

ARL Executive Committee

Committee on a National Periodicals System

Richard De Gennaro (1980)
John P. McDonald (1980)
Peter Paulson, N.Y. State Library (1981)
Allen B. Veaner (1980)
James Schmidt, Chairman (1980)

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice-President, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

James F. Govan (1979)
Joanne Harrar (1979)
David H. Stam, Chairman (1979)

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution of War, Peace, and Revolution
J.M.D. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Nina Lencek, Columbia University
Laurence Miller, University of Illinois
Joseph A Placek, University of Michigan
Anna Stuliglowa, Cornell University
Wojciech Zalewski, Stanford University
David H. Kraus, Library of Congress, Chairman

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California at Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Bibliographic Control (1980)

Joseph H. Howard, Library of Congress
Merle Boylan
Susan Brynteson, Indiana University
Ake I. Koel, Yale University
James F. Govan, Chairman
Richard M. Dougherty (liaison with T.F. on Nat. Lib. Network Development)

Task Force on ARL Statistics (1979)

Donald Koepp
Kendon Stubbs, University of Virginia
Richard J. Talbot, Chairman

Task Force on National Library Network Development (1980)

Hugh Atkinson
Patricia Battin
Russell Shank
William J. Studer
William J. Welsh
Richard M. Dougherty, Chairman

Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria (1979)

William J. Studer
James F. Wyatt
Jay K. Lucker, Chairman
Richard J. Talbot (liaison with T.F. on ARL Statistics)

Advisory Committee, Bibliographic Control of Materials in Microform - Planning Grant

Robert Grey Cole, University of Missouri-Columbia
Linda Hamilton, University Microfilms International
Richard Dougherty
Alan Meckler, Microform Review, Inc.
Susan Severtson, Research Publication, Inc.
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Allen Veaner, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ALA Committee on Cataloging:
Description and Access. . . . . Carol Mandel
ALA Interlibrary Loan Committee . . . . . .Jay Lucker
ALA Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee . . . Carol Mandel
ANSI Committee Z39. . . . . .John Lorenz
CONSER Advisory Group . . . . . .Carol Mandel
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials . . . . . .William Budington
LC Bibliographic Advisory Committee . . . . . .James Govan
LC Cataloging in Publication Advisory Group . . . . .Carol Mandel
LC Network Advisory Committee . . . . . Richard Dougherty
Society of American Archivists. . . . . C. Herbert Finch, Cornell
Universal Serials & Book Exchange . . . . . Joanne Harrar

CENTER FOR CHINESE RESEARCH MATERIALS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Roy Hofheinz, Jr., Harvard University
Ying-mao Kau, Brown University
David T. Roy, University of Chicago
Weiying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Philip J. McNiff, Chairman

OFFICE OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARY MANAGEMENT STUDIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Millicent D. Abeil
Page Ackerman, UCLA Graduate School of Library and Information Science
Frank P. Grisham
Louis Martin
William J. Studer
Irene B. Hoadley, Chairman

APPENDIX - E

MEMBERSHIP LIST
OCTOBER 1979

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2JB
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 626-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Riggs, Libn.
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Copley Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University Library
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Sterling J. Albrecht, Act. Dir.
(801) 374-1211 Ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
C. James Schmidt, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
Joseph Rosenthal, Director
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library, Davis
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California Library, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
Russell Shank, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California Library, Riverside
P.O. Box 5900
Riverside, California 92507
Eleanor Montague, Univ. Libn.
(714) 787-3221

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Millicent D. Abell, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
The University Library
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Allen B. Veaner, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin. &
Director of Libraries (513) 475-2218

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80309
Clyde Walton, Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Patricia Battin, Vice Pres.
& Univ. Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
Louis E. Martin, Univ. Libn.
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Margaret A. Otto, Libn.
(603) 646-2235

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Connie Dunlap, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Herbert F. Johnson, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles E. Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
David Bishop, Director
(404) 542-2716

University of Guelph Library
Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1
Margaret Beckman, Chief Libn.
(519) 824-4120

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Oscar Handlin, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(808) 948-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robert V. Haynes
Interim Dir. of Libs.
(713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh C. Atkinson, Director
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47401
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Lib. Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Lib. Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Susan K. Martin, Libn.
(301) 338-8325

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul A. Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries
(216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-2217

McGill University Library
Montreal, P.Q., Canada H3C 3G1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University Library
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
Graham R. Hill, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4359

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Inst. of Technology Libs.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay K. Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Miami Library
P.O. Box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Frank Rodgers, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Richard M. Dougherty, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard E. Chapin, Director
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-4701

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-4248

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A 0N4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 966-1623

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

The Newberry Library
60 West Walton Street
Chicago, Illinois 60610
Joel L. Samuels, Dir. of Lib. Sers.
(312) 943-9090

The University of New Mexico
General Library
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
Paul Vassallo, Dean of Lib. Sers.
(505) 277-4241

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-7231

New York State Library
Cultural Education Center
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12234
Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian
(518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-7676

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
Robert C. Miller, Librarian
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William J. Studer, Director
(614) 422-4241

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
Sul H. Lee, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
Donald T. Smith, Act. Dir.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Donald Koepp, Director
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Margot B. McBurney, Chief Libn.
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main, Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Samuel Carrington, Interim Director
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Alan R. Taylor, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Hendrik Edelman, Univ. Libn.
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at 10th St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Robert Maloy, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of South Carolina Libraries
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libs.
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 741-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of
Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
Libraries
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
John J. Farley, Acting Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Director
(716) 636-2965

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Library
Stony Brook, New York 11794
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Lib.
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald C. Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Paley Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Joseph A. Boisse, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Harold W. Billings, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A&M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
William Newman, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger K. Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Vanderbilt University Library
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ.
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libs.
(703) 961-5593

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026 or 7849

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Allene F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(314) 889-5000

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario Libraries
London 72, Canada
Robert Lee, Director of Libs.
(519) 679-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

York University Library
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario, Canada M3J 2R2
Anne Woodsworth, Director
(416) 667-2235